

# THEOLOGY

A Monthly Journal of Historic Christianity

Edited by the Rev. E. G. SELWYN, D.D., REDHILL RECTORY, HAVANT,  
to whom all editorial matters should be addressed.

Vol. XVI

JUNE, 1928

No. 96

## EDITORIAL

### "EXPECTO" AND OTHER BOOKS

SOME years ago we reviewed in these columns Professor J. Y. Simpson's *Man and the Attainment of Immortality*, and welcomed it as one of the best books of recent years on the correlation of Christianity with the twentieth century's outlook on the world. The book evidently made the same impression on the mind of the Dean of Chester, who has now followed it up with an application of Dr. Simpson's principles to the problem of the future life. *Expecto*\* has for its subtitle "A Biology of the World to Come"; and, though much lighter than that of the Edinburgh Professor, is not less suggestive and important. Dealing as it does with a subject of perennial interest, it endeavours to reconstruct the Christian doctrine of resurrection in such a way as to exhibit its close contact with what Evolution has taught us of the universe; and a new light is thrown from this angle on much in the teaching of our Lord and His Apostles which is only too apt to seem outside the ways and the thought of common life.

What Christianity promises, says the Dean, is not the immortality of the soul, but life now and hereafter for those who will claim it; and we may therefore suppose that biology, which is the science of life, will be able to teach us much about our destiny. Just as science has elucidated the origins of things by "extra-polating the curve of knowledge" backwards into the infinite past, so it is fair to assume that we may gain some intimations of the future by carrying that same curve forwards. And in particular biology has revealed three things about living organisms—first, a vital urge or appetency, impelling the organism to reach forward out of itself to satisfy some need; secondly, the fact that organic progress has been towards

\* Simpkin, Marshall and Co., 1926. 3s. 6d. net.



increasing freedom and control of environment through the development of increased faculties; and thirdly, that such progress has made for ever-growing individuality through the formation of more, and more rich and various, relationships.

The first might be illustrated by the fact that evolution appears to contain a real progress, and not merely change; the second by the development of anatomy in birds and beasts, by the wonderful devices of protective colouring, by the strange instinct which leads the sunflower always to twist itself round so as to face the sun; the third by a comparison of the nature of plants with that of animals, or that of animals with that of man. But when we come to apply these principles to human life, we note a difference: they require for their application a larger field than man's "threescore years and ten" provide. Man has the same appetency as other living things; but human experience shows that it is not satisfied here, but points to a life beyond the limits of mortality. Man, again, is not now developing new organs for the increase of his freedom; he buys spectacles but does not grow eyes, builds aeroplanes but does not grow wings: the growing control of his environment—that is to say, if it is to be something more permanent than a toy or a machine—must be won on another plane than the purely physical. His sense of individuality, moreover, will not let him believe that, though he knows himself the heir of all the ages, he has no more destiny as an individual than is represented by his mortal span on earth; and this conviction is reinforced by his experience of relationship with an unseen and spiritual order in which the limiting conditions of his life here seem no more than an "enclave."

---

"Are there few that be saved?" Biology at least points to an affirmative answer. In each grade and grouping of life the line of progress, in so far as it is an upward line, seems also to be a tapering one. It is only a handful of variations which prove to have survival value; the majority are lost, so far as their individual existence is concerned; they do not succeed in affirming themselves. And what if it be so with human life as well? The purpose of human life, the Dean maintains, is the making or winning of the self, a task which needs eternity for its achievement, though its possibility is determined by the use each makes of his opportunities here and now. Christianity differs from certain other philosophies not in denying that self-realization is the end of life, but in its assertion that this "salvation"\* of the soul can only be achieved through self-

\* Cf. the article by Professor Canney on "Salvation," published in THEOLOGY last August.



forgetfulness and love. "He that loseth his life shall save it." "Except a corn of wheat fall into the ground and die, it abideth alone; but if it die, it bringeth forth much fruit." "Enter ye in at the strait gate: for wide is the gate, and broad is the way, that leadeth to destruction, and many there be which go in thereat; because strait is the gate, and narrow is the way, which leadeth unto life, and few there be that find it."

---

The Dean of Chester has some interesting things to say about the resurrection of the body. Resurrection is the supreme example of life's control over environment, and in particular over "the most proximate environment of all," which is the body; and its issue is freedom. In our Lord we see the whole process perfectly realized. The Transfiguration gave the disciples a glimpse of the transition of human life to a higher stage which would have been normal for all men but for sin, and would have sufficed for our Lord's "departure to the Father," had He not willed to identify Himself with sinners and their penalty. As it was, He took death upon Himself, and the revelation of His future, and of man's, had to come, not through the light upon the mountain, but through the cross and the empty tomb and the appearances. It was thus through resurrection that the complete subjugation of the body to the ends of the individual life was in His case achieved, as it will be in ours. And the result was that complete freedom from the limiting conditions of earthly life of which the Ascension was the pledge.

---

This doctrine of the resurrection of the body through its transformation into other forms of energy is one that the modern analysis of "matter" has made increasingly congenial to the mind; and it is interesting to observe that the Dean agrees with Dr. McNeile\* in the view that the formation of the spiritual body is a process which begins in the Christian life on earth. Dr. McNeile rests this belief on the language of the New Testament, the Dean on biological reasons: but it is worth enquiring whether there may not be something in ordinary human experience which points the same way. We suggest that such indications are, in fact, to be found in physiognomy—in the undoubted control, that is to say, which character and its changes exercise upon the expression of the face. This is obviously the case with the mouth and the eyes and the lines on brow and cheek. We will venture to illustrate it from two incidents in our own personal experience:

\* *The Problem of the Future Life*, pp. 110 ff. (Heffer, 1925).



1. Nearly twenty years ago we made the acquaintance of the late Francis Galton, then a very old man, and deeply absorbed in the study of anthropometry. In the course of a conversation he showed us the photograph of a man's face on a picture postcard, and asked what kind of a man we thought it represented. Many guesses were made—a lawyer, a business man, a philosopher, a criminal, a judge, and so forth; but all were wrong. Then he told us. It was the photograph of twenty-one successive Mayors of New York! The process of composite photography had then been lately developed, and Galton thought of turning it to good purpose in this way. And as a study in the physiognomical expression of character it was a portrait one could never forget.

2. A few years ago we found ourselves at a little village church in the West of England, where Benediction followed Evensong; and the vicar and his wife asked us into their house after service. They were talking about Benediction and its converting power as an act of worship; and Mrs. X. related the following experience. She is an artist and portrait painter; and a few years before she had been painting the portrait of a young man who was their guest. He had had a public school and university education, and through all those days had possessed a living and happy Christian faith. Then came the war; and, like so many men of his age, he found his faith crushed and withered by it, and came back an agnostic. He used to stay sometimes with Mr. and Mrs. X., and on one of these visits he sat to Mrs. X. for his portrait. Very occasionally he used to go to church; and on one of these occasions, at Benediction, he had a piercing vision of our Lord. It was utterly overwhelming in its immediacy and power; and he came out of church a changed and converted man, crushed and bewildered, but with all his old faith restored, and restored in far richer form. Mrs. X. told us that at the time her portrait of their guest was almost finished; but so radical and complete was the change of face as a result of this conversion that she had to throw her canvas aside and begin again at the beginning.

There are two instances of the power of character to impress itself on, and express itself through, body. In the second case we cannot help wondering whether the physiognomical change does not give us a glimpse of a new stage reached in the making of the spiritual body. And it is not difficult to believe that there may be something there which is permanent and which may extend itself to other parts of the organism besides the face.\*

The pivot of the Dean of Chester's "biology of the world to come" is the Incarnation. Like Professor J. Y. Simpson, he has no doubts as to man having somehow taken a wrong turn and got off the true line of his evolution; and it is only the refashioning of man in Christ which can cancel the consequences of sin and set him again on the true line of his develop-

\* In the law courts of Ancient Greece, counsel used often to excite the jury's prejudice against a party in the suit by saying that he walked fast. And certainly gait and carriage are not unconnected with character.



ment. The infinite weight and magnitude of man's biological inheritance, and the immeasurable consequences according to Nature's laws of his deviation from his true road of progress, are the index of the loving-kindness and condescension of the Incarnation and of Calvary. Faith, moreover, becomes for the Christian a new thing. Faith is the name for that "appetency" of all living things when they become self-conscious and spiritual; and already in the Jew we can see that faith involves a far *steeper gradient* of progress in the individual life than has been involved hitherto. But in Christianity the gradient is far steeper still; and it is so, we suggest, because there is no faith in the Christian sense without repentance. The line of the soul's progress, that is to say, is not only upwards, but upwards and backwards too; not straight, but elliptical. There is always the search not only after God, but after God in Christ whose action and grace have blotted out the sin of the past.

It is thus that we should endeavour to adapt the utterances of Christian devotion—the thoughts and feelings of Advent, for instance—to the modern outlook on the future life. We have before us a little book entitled *Life Now and For Ever*,\* which is a good example of the traditional Catholic attitude towards death, judgment, and the hereafter. Based largely on Newman's *The Dream of Gerontius*, it expresses simply and well those sentiments of awe and hope, of penitence and aspiration, with which the Christian soul contemplates the unseen future. There are elements in it which differ from the kind of belief in immortality which we have been describing. Immortality is conceived, for example, as an inherent property of every soul; and there follows a doctrine of eternal punishment, consciously endured, which follows logically enough from that premise, but involves an almost intolerable dualism as the ultimate issue of creation. For those, however, who believe that the purpose of life is the making of the self or soul, immortality is not an inherent property of each individual, but the prize which each is here to win; and it is thus conditional on the use made here of the opportunities for repentance and faith. To ignore these opportunities in any final sense is therefore to fail in achieving self-realization and to lose for ever the possibility of life: eternal loss rather than eternal punishment is the right conception. It is interesting to observe that Dr. McNeile, interpreting the teaching of the New Testament on the subject, comes to the same conclusion. Nevertheless nothing is lost, on this view, of the awfulness of death or of the

\* By John Corner Spokes. Robert Scott, 1926. 2s. net.



need of repentance; and there still stands between our sins and their reward, only now in a more rational context, the one atoning sacrifice of Christ which the Church proclaims and consecrates afresh in every Eucharist.

The Dean of Chester is insistent that heaven and the life to come are as much a part of the universe as this earth and the whole solar system. By quite different methods Dr. Nairne in *The Life Eternal Here and Now*\* instils the same truth. "There are not two distinct mansions, heaven and earth, of the senses of the Spirit . . . the master truth is that all the many mansions are in the one complete house of the Father." The whole universe, that is to say, seen and unseen alike, is one Temple of the living God. For the rest, however, Dr. Nairne's book and the Dean's rarely touch one another. Dr. Nairne's is a half-mystical musing upon the New Testament, and especially the Johannine, teaching about eternal life. We find ourselves not infrequently questioning the Professor's exegesis; his treatment of the title Son of Man, for instance, his interpretation of the spiritual body, which each is destined to wear, as the corporate body of the redeemed, and his use of such a phrase as "My Father, your Father, our Father in heaven," as though the third phrase was used by our Lord as correlative with the first two—all these seem to us to invite criticism. On the other hand, every now and again we light upon memorable comment in this little book. "There is an awe," he says, "at the Last Supper when He lays aside the garments of our transitory life and robes Himself again in the eternities of the Word that was and is and shall be everywhere and everywhen." And, again, Dr. Nairne says unequivocally that "the background" of the Fourth Gospel "is the daily habit of sacramental devotion in the church," a statement wholly warranted, we believe, by recent New Testament study—witness, for example, Deissmann and Heiler—but one which would surely have startled the theologians of a generation ago. We are glad, too, that Dr. Nairne has drawn attention to the need of correcting the usual punctuation in St. John xiii. 33, 34, and shows how it should be done.

Christianity, as we have said, is irrevocably committed to a doctrine of resurrection rather than of immortality; and it refuses to believe that the body has no part in the life of the world to come. The Dean of Chester shows how consonant

\* Longmans, 1928. 3s. 6d. net. We cannot refrain from entering a protest against the methods of punctuation employed in this book. They seriously impair the pleasure of reading it.



this doctrine is with the philosophy of evolution, and Dr. McNeile throws fresh light on it from the New Testament; and now the argument is reinforced from a third source by Dr. Gavin, whose knowledge of Jewish thought around the beginnings of our era is probably unrivalled. Dr. Gavin's book is entitled *The Jewish Antecedents of the Christian Sacraments*,\* and represents three lectures delivered at Sion College last year: it is a masterpiece of learning, and should on no account be missed. In the first lecture he shows convincingly that much which has been written as to the absence of sacramental ideas from Jewish theology is beside the point. Rather, the truth is that the whole dualistic philosophy on which the Liberal Protestant repudiation of sacraments is based is foreign to Rabbinic ways of thinking. For the Jew, man was a unity, at once physical and spiritual—"psycho-somatic" is the word Dr. Gavin coins for it: and the Jewish teaching about the Creation, about sin and its cleansing, about immortality, and about worship all enshrined this principle. And it is interesting to observe that Rabbinic scholarship here joins forces with modern philosophical exposition of the Real Presence in the Eucharist. The argument, for example, of the paper by Mr. Spens and Professor Taylor in the *Report of the Anglo-Catholic Congress, 1927*,† turns mainly on the principle that our experience is a unity, compact of physical and spiritual both. "We are not merely spiritual beings. We are spiritual beings who have a particular nature." And it is this which accounts for the fact that the Christian conception of immortality takes the form of a doctrine of resurrection and that the Church's characteristic form of worship is sacramental. The supreme proof that the principle has divine endorsement is, of course, the Incarnation.

Dr. Gavin's second lecture is concerned with the relation of Christian Baptism and its ritual to Jewish Baptism. Not only are the affinities of the two rites marked; but Rabbinic teaching as to the effects of proselyte Baptism—as, for example, that the convert is "like a babe one day old"—affords a striking preparation for the doctrine of baptismal regeneration. This being so, the record of our Lord's conversation with Nicodemus in St. John iii., embedded as it is in a baptismal context (i. 19, 33; iii. 22, 30), and following so closely the examples of the new purification given in the previous chapter, takes on a fresh significance; the connexion of Baptism with rebirth had already been prepared for in Judaism. And not less interesting is Dr. Gavin's third lecture, entitled "*Berakha* and Eucharist."

\* S.P.C.K., 1928. 5s.

† Society of St. Peter and St. Paul, 1928. 7s. 6d. net.



Dr. Gavin agrees with Dr. Oesterley in the now common view that the Last Supper was the *Kiddush* of Passover eve; and Jewish customs are recalled by many features of the primitive Christian Eucharist.

The Christian Eucharist became explicitly sacramental by the implicit recognition of His significance who, as a Jew, is claimed to have instituted an observance based on Jewish models. Jewish precedents, usages, and ideas determined its form. Christian theology established its meaning . . . He who instituted the observance of the breaking of the bread, gave thanks over it, and called it His Body. The thanksgiving was potent, since He who spake it was God Incarnate. The Word had pronounced the words, "This is My Body," and His word of blessing effected that which it expressed.

It will be seen how closely Dr. Gavin's conception of consecration accords with that which the Dean of Wells developed in *THEOLOGY* in February, 1924.

Our readers are familiar with the main lines of P. de la Taille's theology of the Eucharistic sacrifice; those who are not will find a concise summary of it from his own pen in a paper contributed to *Catholic Faith in the Holy Eucharist*.<sup>\*</sup> The fundamental idea underlying sacrifice is that of oblation, donation, giving; the ritual sacrifice represents the worshipper's impulse to give himself to God. This is every man's duty, the purpose of his being, and his one true worship: but the long and tangled story of sacrificial rites is proof of man's conviction that he fails to achieve it. One only, Jesus Christ, the incarnate Son, offered in man by His perfect life, and for man by His atoning death, the acceptable sacrifice. And the Last Supper was the hour, and the Eucharist the act, in which He offered and consecrated to the Father His now certain Passion and death to be the propitiation for the world's sin and the door of eternal life. The Resurrection and Ascension are the guarantee that the sacrifice was accepted; and it is that accepted sacrifice which the Church consecrates afresh in perpetual memorial whenever the Eucharist is celebrated.

The present writer used the word "consecrate" in this connexion in a recent paper;<sup>†</sup> and we are interested to note that P. de la Taille adverts to it in a discussion of M. Lepin's theology which he has contributed to *Gregorianum* (ix., 3-64). He says there that certain continental divines of the sixteenth century were accustomed to use the terms "oblation" or "consecration"

<sup>\*</sup> Heffer, third edition, 1928. 6s. net.

<sup>†</sup> Report of the Anglo-Catholic Congress, 1927, pp. 96, 99, 100.



indifferently for the "ritual donation" in the Mass: but he himself clearly prefers "oblation." For our part, however, we prefer "consecration," as signifying more plainly those priestly acts which invest the victim's death with its sacrificial significance;\* while "oblation" seems to us more suitably used of the whole sacrificial action, which includes these acts as well as the immolation. Further, of the three terms used to express the relation of the Eucharistic sacrifice to the death of Christ—"pleading," "offering," "consecrating"—the last named seems to us to be most consonant with St. Paul's language in 1 Cor. ix. 26, to recall most clearly our Lord's own words in the High-Priestly prayer (St. John xvii. 19), and to be the fullest of devotional content.

*What is God Like?*† is the title of a book written by the Bishop of Winchester at the request of the B.B.C. as a kind of accompaniment to a short course of sermons recently addressed over the wireless to listeners-in. After a short introductory chapter on the supreme value of religion, the Bishop proceeds to discuss three "Sign-Posts" which point towards the truth—viz., Science, Art, and Myself. Under the title of "How Men began to know God," the third chapter deals with the revelation through the prophets, and gives as good a bird's-eye view of the matter as we know; and the way is thus prepared for a simple and forceful exposition of the revelation in Christ. The two final chapters are concerned with the problem of evil and with the practice of the Christian life. The whole book is written with the directness, lucidity, and wealth of apt illustration which we associate with the Bishop of Winchester; and it will be very useful in giving form and content to the popular Christianity of our day.

There is one point in connexion with the growing vogue of broadcasted services and sermons to which we think it time that attention should be drawn. Those who go to church reckon it as part of their normal duty as worshippers to contribute alms for the maintenance of their worship and the promotion of the Church's work at home and abroad. How far is this duty of supporting the Church inculcated, or provision made for the practice of it, in connexion with broadcasting? The religious services offered by the B.B.C. would be quite impossible apart from the vigorous life of the religious institutions of the country; and we hope that those responsible for this great spiritual development of recent years may give the joy of Christian giving the place it deserves in the lessons of faith.

\* Cf. the Master of Corpus's article in *Essays Catholic and Critical*.

† Hodder and Stoughton, 1928. 2s. 6d. net.



## THE BOOK OF RUTH

THE Book of Ruth has the same kind of value in O.T. literature as the Song of Songs. Like that book, it delineates scenes from the life of the people not coloured by any religious or political propaganda or tendency. Hebrew literature in general is so didactic and so much concerned with religious conceptions that these little books, which are not primarily occupied with religious thought, but deal with secular affairs, have a charm which is all their own. This charm must have been felt by the Jewish Rabbis when they appointed the Song to be liturgically used at the Passover and Ruth at Pentecost. The present writer also has felt the charm of Ruth, and it may be his excuse for examining the genesis of this little book, and for seeking to ascertain (if possible) the period of its composition.

This book, like the Song of Songs,\* rests on a basis of fact—namely, the existence of a Moabite alliance in the ancestry of David. There does not seem to be any reason to doubt this fact, which is not in itself unlikely, having regard to the geographical situation of Judah and Moab, and to the practical identity of language between them; and the fact is strongly confirmed by the statement that when David was in Adullam he went over to Mizpeh in Moab, and confided his aged parents to the care of the King of that country (1 Sam. xxii. 3-4), who was probably very willing to support a rival of his enemy Saul (1 Sam. xiv. 47). Nor does this fact seem to be rendered any less likely by the circumstance that at some period "in the days when the Judges judged," Moab had taken part in a movement of Trans-Jordanic nations against Benjamin and Ephraim (Judg. iii. 12-30). For at this period Judah seems to have stood aloof from the life of the other tribes, taking no part even in the great confederacy of these tribes against Sisera. What Judah seems rather to have been troubled by was in the form of attacks from Edom.†

The little community of Bethlehem Ephrata‡ (Ruth i. 2; iv. 11; 1 Sam. xvii. 12; Mic. v. 1), so insignificant as hardly to be reckoned as a clan (בֵּית) of Judah, must have been very full of joy and pride when a great King of Israel and the founder of an enduring dynasty arose from their modest village. All manner of stories and legends about David and his family would spring up in his native place and be related by fathers to sons. Some of these stories would recount the praiseworthy conduct

\* Cannon, *Song of Songs*, p. 72.

† See Cannon, "Israel and Edom," *THEOLOGY*, September, 1927, p. 135.

‡ Perhaps *Beth-Ephrata*. See Sellin, *Zwölfprophetenbuch*, p. 288.



and happy fate of David's Moabite great-grandmother, Ruth, and a time arrived when a gifted writer, familiar with these stories, embodied them in this little gem of a narrative, his motive being to show how righteously and wisely the ancestors of David had behaved in the affairs of life, and thus to enhance the glory of the ruling house which had sprung from them.\* This motive is quite sufficient to account for the book, and renders it unnecessary to assume that so simple and unconscious a story had any tendency, political or religious.

If the story of Ruth had not been based on a true and contemporary tradition, it would never have been invented in later days. The hatred of Moab, which was felt by the people and expressed by the prophets (Amos ii. 1-3; Isa. xvi. 6-14; Zeph. ii. 8, 9; Jer. xlviii.; Ezek. xxv. 8-11), would never have allowed their greatest King to be thought of as descended from a Moabite woman if the fact had not been historically true and uncontestable.†

The circumstance that the book has a firm basis of historical fact does not preclude the view that it may contain elements due to the imagination of the author, or to the form in which the story was current among the people. Especially it has been suggested that the names given to the characters are not historical. As regards the somewhat shadowy forms of Elimelech and his sons, who take no part in the action of the book, there is some ground for this view. The name of Elimelech is given in two varying forms‡ in the LXX, and the names of Machlon§ (sickness) and Kilion (consumption) may have been supplied by the author in view of their untimely deaths—the true names not being extant in the current legend. In the same way the name of the *goel* (iv. 1) is not given at all. But the case is otherwise with the names of the real actors, which were doubtless preserved by tradition. *Boaz*,|| curiously enough, is found again as the name of one of the great columns before Solomon's temple (1 Kings vii. 21), a fact which seems to show that the name in Ruth is not an imaginary or invented name. *Noemi* has no possible secondary implication, and proper names from the same root are not unfrequent.¶ As regard *Orpa* and *Ruth*,\*\*

\* Baudissin, *Einleit.*, pp. 301-2.

† See Oettli, *Com.*, p. 215.

‡ B always Ἀβειμέλεχ; A, Ἐλιμέλεχ.

§ Similar names derived from חָלַה are not uncommon, as מְחִלִּי (Exod. vi. 19, Num. iii. 20, 1 Chron. xxiii. 23, xxiv. 30), מְחִלָּה (Num. xxvi. 58), מְחִלָּה (2 Chron. xi. 18).

|| LXX B, βόος; A, βοός = ἰσχυρός, "In Him is strength."

¶ *Masc.*, מְעִי (1 Chron. iv. 15). מְעִי (Gen. xlv. 21, Num. xxvi. 40, 2 Kings v. 1). *Fem.*, מְעִיָּה (Gen. iv. 22, 1 Kings xiv. 21). The ending in *yoel* is an old fem. ending also found in Syr., Ges. K., 80 l.

\*\* Ruth has been variously derived from (a) רָעִית (Eccles. v. 10, Kri), (b) רָעִיתָ (Syr. Ruth and Matt. i. 5), (c) רָעַח to refresh. None of these is very satisfactory.



the derivation and meaning are in both cases very uncertain. The writer is disposed to think that we have here the Moabite names of these women faithfully preserved in the popular tradition.

Objections have been made to the historical character of this story.\* It is suggested that the times of the Judges were so rough and wild that it cannot be thought that such a moral and religious life could be lived in them as is depicted in this book. Now there is in Ruth very little allusion to religious ideas, and none to religious institutions. No priest or sacrifice is mentioned. In this respect the atmosphere is even more primitive than in the oldest parts of Judges. And in other respects can it be seriously argued that all the inhabitants of Judah at this period were in such a state of distress and savagery that a farmer could never reap his harvest or discuss the redemption of the family land before the elders at the gate, or marry and have children? Judah had indeed wars to endure, and a period of subjugation to a foreign invader (Judg. iii. 8-11), but there must have been long periods of quiet when life went on normally. In later times, when the Philistine wars were fierce and continuous, they did not prevent Jesse at the same village from bringing up seven sons and keeping a flock of sheep in the open country (1 Sam. xvii. 12, 14), and the family sacrificial feast was duly held (1 Sam. xx. 29). Farming and marriage go on and must go on in the worst times.

One trait in the book certainly embodies an old religious conception. When Ruth says to Noemi (i. 16), "Thy country shall be my country, and thy God my God," she reveals the primitive belief that the rule of a god only extends to his own country, and that in passing from Moab to Judah she was leaving the territory of Kemosh to enter that of Jahweh. An exact parallel to this line of thought may be found in 1 Sam. xxvi. 19, where David, about to flee from Judah to Philistia, says: "They have driven me today from being attached to the inheritance of Jahweh, saying, Go, serve other gods." This trait of primitive religious thought could hardly have been invented by the author; it seems more probable that the whole of this beautiful speech of Ruth was handed down by tradition. Like the vivid scene in iv. 1-12, it breathes the spirit of a primitive time handed down from one generation to another.

The period in which this book was written is not very easy to determine, but there are indications which may be of assistance. The author seems to have been acquainted with the book J. The aspiration (iv. 12), "May thy house be like the house of Peres, whom Tamar bare to Judah," suggests that he

\* Wellhausen, *Comp.*, iii., p. 234. Bertholet, *Com.* p. 50.



had a knowledge of Gen. xxxviii., and that he views that story as an analogous case of the duty of a *goel* to marry the widow of a deceased relative and preserve the name of the deceased from extinction. Ruth, therefore, was written later than J, which may be roughly dated *circ.* 800.

On the other hand, it seems certain that Ruth was written before the appearance of Deuteronomy. We do not think it possible that our author could have written in so simple and unconcerned a way the words of Boaz (ii. 12), "May Jahweh reward what thou hast done, and may thy reward be complete from Jahweh, the God of Israel, under whose wings thou hast taken refuge," if he had known the stern utterance, "An Ammonite or a Moabite shall not come into the community of Jahweh; even in the tenth generation they shall not come into the community of Jahweh for ever" (Deut. xxiii. 3). The conception that the Moabite woman coming to Judah was freely received into the community of Jahweh, the God of the land, must be very much older than the prohibition in Deuteronomy, which it seems certain our author had never heard of, nor could he have shared the views and opinions which produced its enactment. He belongs to an earlier phase of thought.

The description in iv. 1-12 of the *geullah*, the obligation of relatives of a deceased man to marry his widow, redeem his land and perpetuate his name, and especially the allusion to Judah and Tamar in this connection, also seem to point to a period of composition earlier than the appearance of Deuteronomy. It cannot be doubted that the usage described in Ruth is older\* than that mentioned in Deut. xxv. 5. The transaction as narrated in Ruth is, as Steuernagel remarks, not free from juristic difficulties,† but it is clearly different from, and of a much wider scope than, the law of Levirate marriage in Deuteronomy. The objects aimed at by this older customary law were two: the marriage of the widow of a dead man so that his race should be continued, and the preservation to that race of the family land. These may also have been the objects of the legislation in Deuteronomy,‡ but the ancient rule did not limit the obligation to the *Levir*, or husband's brother; it was due from every male relation in a known and specified order. It was clearly expected of the nearest of kin that he should redeem the estate and marry the widow;§ he could, however,

\* See Ewald, *Alterthümer*, E.T., p. 210. Dillmann, Gen. vi., p. 398.

† In ver. 5, after קִנִּיתָ (Kri), LXX reads καὶ ἀδελφὴν κτήσασθαι σε δεῖ. Lat. omits וּמָצָאת before רִוּת, and adds *debes accipere*. Syr. reads אֲנִיחָהּ דְּהוּ דְּמִית קִנִּי. We should read with Bertholet:

קִנִּיתָ נָם אֶת־רִוּת.

‡ Nowack, *Archäol.*, i., p. 344.

xvi. 96

§ Benzinger, *Archäol.*, p. 345.



decline to do so, and the next of kin after him could take up the duty. The cases of both Tamar and Ruth show that there was a pressure upon the *goel* to fulfil this duty which was not easy to resist; and it was as *goel*, and not as *levir*, that Boaz was invited by Ruth to act. It is not known how long this customary law continued to be in operation in Israel, but it seems still to have prevailed when the Book of Ruth was written. This appears not only from the freshness and vividness of the description in chapter iv., but from the fact that the author names one feature in his story as obsolete and no longer practised (iv. 7). If he had been writing an ideal reconstruction of an archaic scene he would not in this way have singled out one detail only as belonging to the past. It was evidently, except this detail, a scene of a kind with which he was not unfamiliar. This wide obligation can hardly have been in force when Deut. xxv. 5-10 was written, or it could not have been passed over in silence in that place where the obligation is limited to one special case. It is to be noticed that this law in Deuteronomy deals only with widows' *marriage*, and that the later legislation in Lev. xxv. 23 *f.* only concerns the *redemption of land*, while the scene in Ruth combines both these elements. Both the law in Deuteronomy and that in Leviticus would appear to be partial survivals of the older customs described in Ruth iv. 1-12.

For these reasons we suggest that Ruth was written between 800 and 620, but within these limits can a closer approximate date be found? We think there was a period to which the book might not unreasonably be assigned. In the time of Hezekiah, when the kingdom of Judah was occupied by the Assyrians, cities burned, large numbers of the inhabitants carried away captive, the capital beleaguered, the King insulted, a remarkable prophetic voice proclaimed that from Bethlehem Ephrata a King would arise to rule over Israel, of ancient lineage, who would bring salvation from Assyria\* (Mic. v. 1-5). In this very striking oracle the ruling Davidic dynasty is not named; there is rather an expectation that this deliverer will arise from the clan inhabiting Ephrata, the family of Jesse (as 1 Sam. xvii. 12). A similar thought is found about the same time in another oracle (Isa. xi. 1-10) that from the stump of Jesse—a stump with holy seed in it (Isa. vi. 13)—there will be a new green shoot, a ruler full of the Divine Spirit, who will establish a reign of righteousness and peace. Here also there is no allusion to the ruling dynasty. The expectation revealed by these oracles that the saving Messiah would arise from the family of Jesse at Ephrata rather than from the existing Davidic line is a curious phenomenon, which perhaps had its origin in

\* See Sellin, *op. cit.*, p. 288.



dissatisfaction with the submission to Assyria on the part of Ahaz, or with the apparently hopeless resistance of Hezekiah to that power. Anyhow, there was such an expectation, and it may possibly have aroused in the author of Ruth a desire to make known to his countrymen generally some of the local tradition of Ephrata about the ancestors of Jesse and the pious and prudent way in which they had preserved the family inheritance. He was most likely to write about the family history of Jesse at Ephrata at a time when the family and the village were prominent in prophetic aspiration.

In recent times, however, an opinion has prevailed that the book is of post-exilic origin, and was really composed as a polemical pamphlet by someone who did not approve of the action of Nehemiah and Ezra (Ezra ix., x.; Neh. xiii. 23-27), compelling the Jews to put away their Moabite or other foreign wives and forbidding such unions for the future.\* It is hard to imagine any book less suited for such a purpose or less like a controversial writing. It tells its story in a simple, natural way without emphasis or argument, or any sign of tendency. The only such sign which is or can be suggested is that Ruth is six times called "the Moabite" (i. 22; ii. 2, 6, 21; iv. 5, 10)† and once a "foreigner" (ii. 10). We cannot think that these traits afford any proof of tendency. Ruth was probably described by these appellations in the local traditions as they came to the author. If the book was meant for polemic against Ezra's rule, it was singularly unsuited for that purpose, as it did not deal with a parallel case. The men rebuked by Ezra were residents in Judah who brought foreign wives there. But in the story in Ruth, Machlon, when resident in Moab, married there a woman of the country, and when she came to Judah as Machlon's widow the *goel* was *obliged* to marry her, Moabite or not, or he could not redeem Machlon's land, as he was bound by social rules to do. It is quite a different situation from the one combated by Ezra, and no use at all as an argument. If the book were regarded as polemical at all it would rather have to be regarded as directed against the severe enactment of Deut. xxiii. 4 forbidding a Moabite from ever being admitted into the community of Jahweh as Ruth was. But we are quite unable to see any indication that the book has any controversial design of any sort.

The difficulty of attributing the book to the time of Ezra and Nehemiah is that the glory of the Davidic line had altogether faded away at that epoch. It seems likely that shortly after the

\* Kuenen, *Einleit.*, I., 2, p. 192; Cornill, *Einleit.*, vii., p. 147; Steuernagel, *Lehrbuch*, p. 438; Bertholet, *op. cit.*, pp. 54-58.

† The LXX has not this word in ii. 21.



return from the Exile Zerubbabel, under prophetic incitement (Hag. ii. 21; Zech. iv. 6, 7, etc.), made an attempt to restore the rule of the house of David in Judah.\* If such an attempt was made it failed, and was never repeated. Zerubbabel and the royal house disappear from history. The Messiah-King foretold in Zech. ix. 9 is not expected to come from the house of David or the clan of Jesse. Indeed, at a later period the "house of David" seem to have been living as private persons in Jerusalem (Zech. xii. 12). It was not in a period when Davidic rule had terminated that one would expect stories of its origins to be written or read. Such stories would be appropriate and welcome in the days of the great Kings, but there would be no impulse to write them and very little desire to know them after the dynasty had fallen without hope of revival and Judah was part of a Persian satrapy.

It has been suggested that the language of Ruth is such as to imply a post-exilic origin. The beautiful style of the book as a whole certainly does not raise any such implication. "The general Hebrew style (the idioms and the syntax) shows no marks of deterioration; it is palpably different, not merely from that of Esther and Chronicles, but even from Nehemiah's memoirs or Jonah, and stands on a level with the best parts of Samuel."† It is pointed out, however, that a few words seem to be Aramaisms or late Hebrew locutions. As regards Aramaisms, this feature is of little or no significance. Gunkel‡ has recently observed that "the task of distinguishing Aramaic words which are to be found in the most ancient texts from those which were not introduced till later times is a problem for the future. In the meantime it is only with the greatest reservation that we should draw the conclusion of a late origin from Aramaisms." Further, it is certain that in the time of Hezekiah there were persons in Jerusalem who had a perfect knowledge of Aramaic (2 Kings xviii. 16), and it is not unreasonable to assume that so fine a literary artist as the author of Ruth would know at any rate a few words of that language.

It is a curious fact that the words in Ruth which have an Aramaic quality are all found in one verse (i. 13)—namely, לָהֵן *bis* -עַן-שָׁבַר. לָהֵן "therefore" is found in the Aramaic of Daniel (ii. 6, 9; iv. 24). But here in Ruth it seems from the LXX and Latin to be a textual error for לָהֵן.‡ The form

\* See Sellin, *Zerubbabel*, pp. 46 f.

† Driver, *Introd.* i., p. 426.

‡ *Old Testament Essays* (read at Oxford), 1927, p. 119.

§ LXX:

μη αὐτοὺς προσδέξασθε,  
ἢ αὐτοῖς κατασχεθήσασθε.

Lat., *Si eos expectare velitis*. These give a good and powerful sense: "Is it for them ye will hope?"



רָהֹק seems to have come in by dittography from verse 9. עֲנִי occurs nowhere else in Hebrews. שָׁכַר is found in Isa. xxxviii. 18. צַרַּם (ii. 14) is not an Aramaic word.\* It seems to be from the same root as צַרְתִּים (ii. 16), the LXX rendering both by the same word.† Neither word occurs anywhere else.

Other words which have been thought to suggest a post-exilic origin‡ are נִשָּׂא נְשִׁים-קִיָּם-מֵרָא. Of these, a form analogous to מֵרָא (i. 20) is found in Ezek. xxxvi. 5, נְשִׂים (i. 13) in Judg. xxi. 23, and קִיָּם (iv. 7) in Ezek. xiii. 6, etc.

On the other hand, there are words and expressions in Ruth which are only found in pre-exilic writings. פֶּלְנִי אֶלְמִנִי "so and so" (iv. 1), is certainly an old locution (1 Sam. xxi. 3; 2 Kings vi. 2). The post-exilic form is פֶּלְמִנִי (Dan. viii. 13).§ So חֲבַט (ii. 17) is not extant later than Deut. xxiv. 20. The phrase, "So do Jahweh to me, and add to it" (i. 17), never occurs after 2 Kings; the phrase, "All the city was in a commotion," חֲרָם (i. 19), never after 1 Kings i. 45. יָדַיִם (ii. 17) is found in Isa. xxx. 17, and never after.|| The linguistic features of the book, when considered as a whole, not only do not require, but are almost incompatible with, a post-exilic date for its composition.

It has also been thought that this book must have been written in post-exilic days, because it was included by the Masoretic editors in the *Hagiographa*, and not in the *Prophets*, from which circumstance the inference is drawn that the "Prophetic" Canon was already closed when Ruth was received.¶ This view is not true to history; all the evidence we have shows that Ruth *was* for a long period included in the Prophetic Canon. In the LXX Ruth is placed immediately after Judges, a position which it must have occupied in the Hebrew MSS. used by those translators. Josephus,\*\* in his enumeration of the twenty-two canonical books of the Jews, reckoned Judges and Ruth as one book. Melito of Sardis (*circ.* A.D. 160), who made a special journey to Palestine in order to ascertain how many were the books of the O.T. and in what order they were written, names Ruth in his catalogue immediately after Judges.†† Origen,‡‡ in giving a list of the books of the O.T., names "Judges and Ruth in one book with the Hebrews, which they call *Sophetim*." Jerome testifies to the same effect.§§ And Epi-

\* Driver, *Tenses*, iii., p. 223.

† καὶ ἐβούλετο (ii. 14); ἐκ τῶν βεβουλισμένων (ii. 16).

‡ Bertholet, p. 50; Wellhausen, *u.s.*, p. 234; *Enc. Bib.*, art. "The Book of Ruth."

§ Burney, *Kings*, p. 285.

|| See Driver, *Introd.*, pp. 174, 426.

¶ Wellhausen, *u.s.*

\*\* *Contra Apion*, i. 8.

†† Euseb., *Hist. Ec.* iv., 26.

‡‡ *Ibid.*, vi. 25.

§§ *Prologus galeatus*.



phanus, the learned Bishop of Salamis, who was a native of Palestine (*d.* 402), says, "Ruth is joined together with Judges, and it is counted as one book by the Hebrews."\* Such testimonies as these from such eminent scholars, coupled with the LXX, leave it beyond doubt that for a period of at least 500 years Ruth was included in the "Prophets." But at some late time, which cannot be defined, a practice grew up among the Jews of reading liturgically certain books upon solemn occasions every year. These books were called "the five Megilloth," and were read: the Song of Songs at Passover, Ruth at Pentecost, Lamentations at the 9th of Ab., Ecclesiastes at Tabernacles, Esther at Purim. For obvious reasons of liturgical convenience, these books were put together in one volume in the order of the feasts or occasions on which they were to be read. The volume containing them was called *Machazor*, and seems to have included also the prayers used with them.† It is impossible to fix the time when this collection was made; it was late and post-Talmudic.‡ How or when the five Megilloth were reincorporated in the Canon of O.T. Scriptures does not seem to be known. But it is not difficult to see why Ruth and Lamentations (which latter, treated as a part of Jeremiah, had also formed part of the Prophetic Canon) were not restored to their old positions in that group. The Megilloth had come to be regarded as one whole, and three of the books included in it—the Song, Ecclesiastes, and Esther—were not suited by their nature to be placed among "the Prophets." So it would seem that the five Megilloth went into the Hagiographa as a whole. This arrangement, which had its origin in liturgical and not in critical reasons, has really no bearing at all on the date of the composition of Ruth.

The genealogy (iv. 18-22) forms no part of the original book. The language is that of P, and the piece is excerpted from 1 Chron. ii. 9-12, where it is given in fuller detail. It seems that some editor at a very late period, observing some links of a genealogy in verse 17, and being acquainted with Chronicles, thought it desirable to carry the pedigree back to Peres, son of Judah, who had already been mentioned in iv. 12, and thus to connect David with the beginnings of Israel.§ This genealogy has this special interest for us that it is incorporated in that given by St. Matt. i. 4-6, with very slight changes, but with one very significant addition. The names of Rachab (wife of Salmah) and Ruth (wife of Boaz), foreign women, are added.

\* Quoted by Delitzsch, *op. post cit.*

† Delitzsch, *Praef. ad Baer. Quinque volumina*, pp. iii-iv.

‡ Blau, in *Jewish Enc.*, art. "Megillot—the Five."

§ See Oettli, *Com.*, p. 216.



Thus the Book of Ruth triumphed over the rigidity of Deuteronomy, and perhaps contributed in some slight degree to the admission of Gentiles into the Christian Church.

W. W. CANNON.

## THE TWO MINISTRIES OF CHRIST

### II.—THE MESSIANIC MINISTRY

#### I.

WHAT was the real object of the Last Visit to Jerusalem?

May I approach this question by quoting three important passages from a book, *Jesus Christ in Faith and History*, by the Bishop of Gloucester?

I have no doubt that the plan and purpose of His ministry was that after the message of repentance and righteousness had been preached, when the time had come He should go up to Jerusalem and there proclaim Himself as Messiah and establish His kingdom; and that He should build up a reformed community of Israel, an Assembly or Ecclesia or Church of the Messiah, and that the method by which it was to be established was that of peaceful revolution (pp. 70, 71).

Zechariah had said: "Rejoice greatly, O daughter of Zion; behold thy King cometh unto thee: He is just and having salvation; lowly, and riding upon an ass, even the foal of an ass." Now if Jesus had fulfilled this prophecy, no one would doubt that He claimed to be considered the Messiah. He had revealed Himself on the Mount of Olives, as the prophet had foretold: "And His feet shall stand in that day upon the Mount of Olives" (p. 136).

The cleansing of the Temple was primarily a work of moral authority, but it could not have been accomplished unless Jesus had the support of a considerable body of enthusiastic followers. He cleansed the Temple and for two or three days He dominated it, but He did not use it for any other purpose than as a place of teaching. The Temple was a fortress of great strength, and consequently whenever a false Messiah had appeared, he had always aimed at seizing it, and then making it the base of his military enterprises. That is no doubt what it would be assumed Jesus would do, but it was just what He did not do. Having secured His position in the Temple, He used it simply as a place for His teaching. But the chief priests and other authorities would feel that the position had become dangerous. Here was a prophet who had come from Galilee, who quite clearly was acting as if He was the Messiah. He was surrounded by a body of enthusiastic followers, how numerous we do not know and they did not know. He had quietly taken possession of the Temple. What reason for doubting that He would continue in the same course as other pretenders before Him? They had seized the Temple, and it had taken a great deal of violence to rescue it from them, so naturally preparations would begin to be made for dealing with this situation. No one wanted to have the sort of rebellion they had had before. It was quite true the purpose of Jesus was different, but they did not know that (p. 138).



Much of this, if I may presume to say so, appears to me admirable. In particular I welcome the suggestion that the Cleansing of the Temple could only take place because our Lord had behind Him a body of enthusiastic followers.

And yet there are difficulties.

In the first place, I very much question whether we ought to accept without demur or hesitation the statement that after cleansing the Temple our Lord returned to it and used it for teaching purposes day after day. It is one thing to take a position by surprise while the garrison is asleep. It is another to maintain it. If we can assign to our Lord a credible aim which could have been completely attained by the sudden capture without the subsequent occupation, we may indeed depart more than does the Bishop from the story given by Mark, but our reconstruction will be free from a very real difficulty.

Then, to come to my second objection, I feel that our Lord's motive for cleansing the Temple needs some thinking out. Did He really propose to make Himself a kind of Jewish Pope? For that, I suppose, is what the Bishop's view comes to. I venture to suggest that the truth about our Lord's intentions only begins to dawn upon us when we bear in mind a number of indications all of them pointing one way. Here, perhaps, I can best explain myself by putting a series of questions.

Dr. Headlam admits that our Lord expected to die. Would His death abrogate or not abrogate the necessity for animal sacrifices? After all, animal sacrifice was what the Temple principally stood for. Or we could put the same thing another way. Animal sacrifice is not a practice on which we should any of us expect our Lord to lay much stress; and apart from animal sacrifice it is difficult to see why the new congregation, "the Church of the Messiah," should feel the need of a Temple.

How many temples did our Lord desire His New Israel to possess? It seems not improbable that the allegation assigned to our Lord by the false witnesses goes back to something He really had said; the new spiritual Temple of His own disciples, the congregation of Jeremiah's New Covenant, was to take the place of the Temple made with hands. If, however, His followers *were* the Temple, would they *need* a Temple?

Or, once again, this expression, "a temple made without hands," seems a modification of the "*stone* cut out without hands" (Dan. ii. 34), which was Daniel's figure to describe the Messianic kingdom. Does not this significant change point to our Lord's conception of the kingdom of God, not as a national concern, set in opposition to the kingdoms of this world, but as a spiritual concern, a new religion opposed to existing Judaism and destined to supersede it?



Is there any connection between the Cleansing of the Temple and the cursing of the barren fig-tree? The latter incident seems to represent a symbolic denunciation of existing Judaism. Could one denounce existing Judaism, especially at Jerusalem itself and the very moment before making an assault on the Temple, without having the Temple system very distinctly in view?

Did our Lord expect the Mosaic Law to remain valid for the "Church of the Messiah," or did He propose to substitute a new Messianic Law of His own? The general trend of Jewish eschatological thought would go on the whole to support the latter of these alternatives, and so does the very existence of the Sermon on the Mount. Is it conceivable that Jews would have ascribed to our Lord, as does Matthew, the intention of providing a new Law unless the intention was really His? Their own tendency, as we should expect and as the evidence indicates, was to make Him not less orthodox than He was, but more. Because, of course, the Temple rested on the Law, and if the Law went the Temple would naturally go with it.

How far can we trust the bolder utterances of certain early Christians as representing correctly the mind of Christ? Was Stephen following our Lord or not when on his trial before the Sanhedrin he quoted Isaiah lxvi. 1, 2: "What manner of house will ye build Me, saith the Lord?" Christ certainly knew of this passage, since He quotes the part of it which declares that heaven is God's throne and the earth His footstool in the prohibition of oaths in the Sermon on the Mount; if He knew of what Isaiah said, did He accept what Isaiah said? Or again, was the author of Hebrews speaking only for himself, and not for our Lord as well, when he described the Jewish priests as serving what was, when all was said, a mere temporary tabernacle (Heb. xiii. 10)? Or, to turn to the Fourth Gospel, was John interpreting our Lord rightly or wrongly when he made Him say to the woman of Samaria, "Woman, believe Me, the hour cometh, when neither in this mountain, nor in Jerusalem, shall ye worship the Father . . . the hour cometh, *and now is*, when the true worshipper shall worship the Father in spirit and truth"?

In cleansing the Temple our Lord quoted from the Temple Sermon of Jeremiah. Is it likely that He would have quoted the passage in which Jeremiah was declaring the Temple doomed unless He Himself was declaring the Temple doomed? Did He miss or did He make over again Jeremiah's striking point that God had instituted the moral law but had not instituted the ritual law?

How far are we justified in reading the Cleansing of the



Temple in the light of the denunciations levelled by our Lord at the religious authorities and uttered, we must remember, in the Temple itself? "What, therefore, will the lord of the vineyard do? He will come and destroy the husbandmen and will give the vineyard to others." "The kingdom of God shall be taken from you, and given to a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof." "The publicans and the harlots go into the kingdom of God before you." Why had the old prophets one after another announced doom on the Temple? For the most part because of the idolatry or rapacity of the religious leaders of their day. Is it not likely that when Christ condemned the leaders of His own time quite in the manner of the old prophets, He was also like the old prophets condemning the Temple itself? It is significant that in this series of denunciatory parables and sayings the whole Sanhedrin is involved, and not the Pharisees only. And, indeed, on the face of it, the Cleansing of the Temple is an act directed, not against the Pharisees, but against the Sadducees.

Does it not look, broadly speaking, that just as the Galilean ministry was a kind of battle with the Pharisees, so the Last Visit was a battle with the Sadducees; only, and that is a point of some importance, in this battle with the Sadducees, it is our Lord who is the aggressor.

Had our Lord any definite plan for dispossessing the Sadducees, for dissociating the Sadducees and the Temple? It seems quite impossible that He should have had really any such plan. If He had not, if for Him Sadducees and Temple were indissolubly bound up together, then to all intents and purposes to attack and condemn the Sadducees was to attack and condemn the Temple.

And here we come to a point of such importance that we had better discuss it in a separate section.

Meanwhile I think we can claim that quite a number of indications tend to the same conclusion. Christ had no intention of making Himself a priestly Messiah. The Cleansing of the Temple was His way of declaring that the day of the Temple was over.

## II.

There is a certain saying of our Lord's over which the imagination of the early Church continually hovered in puzzled bewilderment without ever venturing definitely to alight; a saying, however, which they never quoted in its proper context, because their natural Jewish feeling compelled them to refer it to the future, instead of seeing that it pointed to present facts before the eyes of the speaker.



If any genuine kernel is to be found in the apocalyptic speculations of Mark xiii., it is surely the saying which mentions the abomination of desolation standing where it ought not. What did that saying mean? In what connection did our Lord adduce this reference to the prophecy of Daniel? Mark himself, according to Dr. Torrey, regards our Lord as anticipating the project of Caligula to set up his statue in the Jewish Temple. Luke apparently sees in the words an allusion to the compassing of Jerusalem by the Roman armies. But these ideas are makeshifts. Later ingenuity under the stress of patriotic emotion may well have read into our Lord's quotation a thousand things that were not there. The only thing that matters is what our Lord Himself originally said and meant.

At first sight, perhaps, it is a little tempting to take our clue from Luke. If Luke could find the abomination of desolation in the presence of the Roman armies, might not our Lord find the same thing in the bare fact of the Roman domination, and deduce from that fact the inference that the dreams of Jewish nationalism were exploded, or that the nation was exiled for ever from the special favour of God?

But there is, I think, a better explanation.

We have seen that the Cleansing of the Temple was a demonstration against the Sadducees. That gives us the real key. By word as well as by symbolic action, our Lord was declaring that the Temple was doomed, the reason being that Daniel's prediction of the Temple's desecration by a defiling idolatry was finding its manifest fulfilment in the domination exercised over the national worship at the central shrine by men like the Sadducees who had no religion in them.

Why had Ezekiel in his vision found the Temple doomed? Because of the sins of the *elders*.

According to Josephus, the Sadducees disbelieved in any "divine influence on men's actions, good or bad." Josephus probably means, so Dr. Klausner tells us, that the providence of God, in the opinion of the Sadducees, looked after the nation, but did not concern itself with the mere individual; a curious doctrine, doubtless, in the eyes of Him who laid such stress on the care of the heavenly Father for the lilies and the birds. That, then, was what the Judaism of the prophets and the Psalms had come to. Judaism in its present-day form, and as practised by its leading professors, was a barren fig-tree cumbering the ground. The teachers were hypocrites and men-pleasers, the leading priests were atheists. And Christ declares the Temple itself given over to all the abominations of heathendom, because the apostates in charge of it "disbelieved in any divine influence in human affairs."



For our Lord, religion was a matter of inspiration. What He hoped for was the due fulfilment of the old prophets' dream of a spirit-possessed congregation. What was the Temple to Him? It was probably nothing to John the Baptist, but it was certainly nothing to Jesus Christ.

"Is it not written, My house shall be called a house of prayer for all the nations? but ye have made it a den of robbers." The second part of this composite quotation is taken by our Lord from the Temple Sermon of Jeremiah. In the immediately following context the prophet threatens the Temple at Jerusalem with the fate of the shrine at Shiloh. What was the fate of the shrine at Shiloh?

The ark was captured by the Philistines; the Divine Presence was removed elsewhere.

So will it be, according to our Lord, with the Jewish Temple of His day. "Your house is left unto you desolate." In spite of some of the critics, I have little doubt that the reading "desolate" is correct. And our Lord is using it because the "abomination of desolation" is in His mind. "The Lord hath rejected and forsaken the generation of His wrath. . . . They have set their abominations in the house which is called by My name, to defile it." The words occur in Jeremiah vii. 29, 30—that is to say, in the same Temple Sermon in which we are told about the den of robbers.

The ordinary view, of course, is that in cleansing the Temple Christ was rebuking these Sadducees for making money in reprehensible ways. That was no doubt *one* of the charges which Christ brought against them. Had not Zechariah said, "In that day there shall be no more a trafficker in the house of the Lord of hosts"? But to say that He expected the Sadducees to take the slightest notice of the admonition is, of course, fatuous. Hard, cruel, selfish men are not so easily persuaded. No, He can have had but one object. Owing to the things that were going on in the Temple, the money-making, the cynical scepticism, the Sadducean régime generally, God had decided to call the Temple His house no longer. He had done with the Temple and was making other plans.

\* \* \* \* \*

There is another possibility relevant to the question of the abomination of desolation. The last journey of our Lord to Jerusalem may be looked upon as beginning at Cæsarea Philippi. Why had our Lord taken the disciples to Cæsarea Philippi before He led them to Jerusalem? Is there any connection between Cæsarea Philippi and Jerusalem? There is a very close connection, and though I have never seen it remarked on,



the fact may be significant. The Temple at Jerusalem was, of course, Herod's Temple. But it was not Herod's only Temple. It was only one of two. In the very same year in which Herod is said to have built the Temple at Jerusalem he is said to have set to work on another Temple, a Temple to Cæsar Augustus, and naturally containing the statue of that monarch.

And this Temple of Herod to Cæsar Augustus, where was it situated?

At the place which came to be called Cæsarea Philippi.

How would one of the old prophets have regarded the simultaneous building of two Temples, the one to Cæsar, the other to God?

Is it not possible, then, that Christ had taken the disciples to Cæsarea Philippi to make them realize the more vividly this curious instance of a man who served two masters and worshipped two gods, and built two Temples?

True, this is mere conjecture. But unless there is something in it the coincidence is most extraordinary. If the conjecture is justified, the silence of the Gospels is easily explained. For how could the early Christians have told the men of Jerusalem that Christ had denied the special sanctity of that great fane of which they were so proud, because it had been built for them by an apostate Jew, who was, in fact, a worshipper of idols?

\* \* \* \* \*

Another important point about the Cleansing of the Temple has yet to be mentioned.

It is a fairly obvious point, but with the exception of a remark by Dr. Oesterley, made many years ago, I have never seen it referred to.

Mark mentions first in vague terms "them that sold and them that bought," and then more specifically "the tables of the money-changers and them that sold the doves."

Why does not Mark speak as John speaks of the "sheep and oxen"? In particular, for that is the point, *How about the Paschal lambs?* Were any of these being sold or not? Because, if they were, and if our Lord protested against the sale, then the Cleansing of the Temple amounted to a declaration that *the Passover was superseded*.

Such a declaration would be an ideal way of announcing that *the Messianic age had already begun*, or was on the point of beginning: for in that age there would be no Passovers.

It looks, moreover, as if our Lord had carefully chosen the day for His great attack. The Cleansing may well have taken place on Nisan 10; and Nisan 10 was the appointed day for



choosing the lamb and having it inspected in the Temple. It looks as though, besides protesting against the sale of the lambs, Christ was pointing out to those who brought their lambs for inspection that all this trouble was unnecessary; there would be no Passover that year. The Passover would be fulfilled in the kingdom.

This possibility of the date of the Cleansing being Nisan 10 enables us to turn the flank of a possible objection. Jewish scholars seem a little inclined to question if animals were really bought and sold in the precincts of the Temple. They can hardly question the fact that on Nisan 10 the victims were brought to the Temple for inspection. The partial suppression of the truth about our Lord's action is again no difficulty. What Jewish Christian could ever admit that Christ had entered His protest against the sacrificing of the Paschal lambs?

Even if we confine our attention to our Lord Himself, we find His action significant. Instead of bringing His lamb in dutiful humility to the inspecting official, He cleanses the Temple.

Some such reading of the Cleansing has the advantage of making it the natural complement of the institution of the Eucharist. In the Cleansing Christ declared that the Passover must cease to be observed any longer. In the Eucharist He provided a new rite to take the Passover's place.

When Luke makes our Lord speak of the fulfilment of the Passover in the kingdom of God, the meaning clearly is that the joy of the kingdom would take the place of the Passover *for our Lord Himself*.

What, however, our Lord said or signified was not that the kingdom would take the place of the Passover for Himself, but *for everyone*. And He said or signified it by the Cleansing of the Temple.

### III.

It is now, I hope, plain that our Lord's intentions went far beyond what anyone would ordinarily understand by reform or peaceful revolution. His new wine demanded new bottles. Old things were to pass away.

We want another word than reformation to describe the motive of the Last Visit to Jerusalem.

Dr. Headlam himself only misses the mark by inches when he describes the visit as a Messianic coming, and he gets even closer to the truth when he quotes Zechariah in connection with the Messianic Entry: "His feet shall stand in that day upon the Mount of Olives."

In that day. In what day? *In the day of judgment.*



Our Lord came to Jerusalem not to reshape old bottles, or to take the place of Annas and Caiaphas and their like, but to promulgate sentence of doom, doom, however, not on men, but on institutions. The Messianic Entry, the cursing of the fig-tree, the Cleansing of the Temple, all fall into line as parts of a single programme, a single scheme of Messianic judgment.

The Last Visit was the formal coming of our Lord as Judge.

The fact is, of course, partially obscured for us by the obvious resemblance between the denunciations of our Lord and the denunciations of the old prophets. But then, on the one hand, when a Jeremiah, for instance, pronounced sentence on the Temple, and events justified his words, the prophetic activity gets already very close to that of a judge acting in the name of Jehovah. And, on the other hand, our Lord's belief in His Messiahship must surely have meant that in doing any action suggestive of His office as Messiah Judge He could never have regarded Himself as simply acting as a prophet.

#### IV.

Besides the Holy Week narrative there is another section of Mark which seems to favour our view—namely, the section which describes the Transfiguration.

In the first place the way in which Mark introduces this episode is significant. He carefully points out that the Transfiguration took place exactly six days after our Lord's announcement that some of His disciples would live to see the coming of the kingdom of God. That must mean that for Mark the Transfiguration fulfilled the announcement, being presumably nothing less than a revelation of the Son of man: before it our Lord was the Messiah *in posse*, after it the Messiah *in esse*. Does not this rather suggest that for the earliest tradition our Lord's ministry became more openly and definitely Messianic from the Transfiguration onwards? Or, in other words, that He went to Jerusalem as Messiah Judge?

But if He went to Jerusalem as Messiah Judge, what persons or things were the objects of His judgment? Here again the story of the Transfiguration has something to tell us. The disciples first see Moses and Elijah, and then see Moses and Elijah disappear. "The divine voice," says Dr. Rawlinson, quoting with modified approval the opinion of other scholars, "the divine voice bids the disciples from henceforth hearken to Jesus—i.e., no longer to pay heed to Moses and the prophets."

This is highly important. Mark's view is here doubtless the view of Peter, and Peter's view will be the view of our Lord Himself. And the view is the very same view which we found to be symbolized in the Cleansing of the Temple.



It was existing Judaism which was the object of our Lord's judgment.

Suggestive, however, as is the account of the Transfiguration, there is another passage of Mark which to my mind is more suggestive still—namely, the passage (Mark xiv. 28) in which our Lord promises the disciples that after He is risen again He will go before them into Galilee. For this passage, read in the light of Matthew xxviii. 16, "the mountain where Jesus had appointed them," seems to imply, as Dr. Sparrow-Simpson rightly observes, that Christ had arranged for a general meeting of all His disciples after His death. It looks as though, besides condemning the old Israel, our Lord proposed to inaugurate the New Israel of His own disciples.

Thus I think it can be argued:

- (1) That there is a case for thinking that Christ went to Jerusalem as Messiah Judge.
- (2) That there is a case for thinking that He intended after His death to set up His own Ecclesia in Galilee.
- (3) That these two possibilities confirm one another.

V. C. MACMUNN.

### BISHOP KEN AND ROBERT NELSON\*

Not long ago I purchased an extremely interesting copy of Bishop Ken's exposition of the Catechism. The title page reads thus:

AN | EXPOSITION | ON THE | CHURCH-CATECHISM | OR THE |  
PRACTICE | OF | DIVINE LOVE | REVISED

COMPOSED

FOR THE DIOCESE OF BATH & WELLS

LONDON: PRINTED FOR CHARLES BROME, AT THE WEST-END OF  
ST. PAUL'S; AND WILLIAM CLARKE IN WINCHESTER

1686

To start with, there is a little puzzle about the date. When was the first edition published? A letter to Lord Weymouth, mentioning the book as a gift to him, is dated from Winchester

\* For very much help in this article I am indebted to my oldest friend, W. F. D. Curtoys of Oriel, Rector of Cromhall, Glos., who copied out most of Nelson's notes, translated the quotations, and traced several to their sources.



College, August 5, 1685. The imprimatur of Sancroft's domestic chaplain is dated from Lambeth, August 9, 1685. Yet this issue is "revised," indeed is clearly a second edition, as is shown by the variations from the first edition which are given in the manuscript notes which I shall refer to. So far as I can see, neither Dr. Plumptre's *Life of Ken* (which gives his letter to Lord Weymouth) nor Dr. William Hunt in the *Dictionary of National Biography* helps us to answer this question.

It begins with a letter: "To the inhabitants within the Diocese of Bath and Wells, Thomas, their unworthy Bishop, wisheth the knowledge and the Love of God." Ken was consecrated on January 25, 1684. It seems, therefore, as if an early edition, which I have not seen, was issued before that sent to Lord Weymouth, though Ken's letter seems to speak of the book sent as entirely new, and as if the *imprimatur* was for a second edition, and so that the first edition had been very rapidly disposed of.

The book itself is well known to students of the best period of English theology, though hardly so well known as it might be with advantage. It is as temperate as it is pious. It is intensely practical. Its whole aim is to induce parents, teachers, employers, to bring up those committed to their charge, not only in Christian knowledge, but in the deliberate and continuous practice of piety. Its characteristic feature is, as Dean Plumptre said, that the Catechism is turned into a manual of devotion. And, as the copy I possess shows, it was not only a collection of prayers itself, but it taught others to make prayers of their own.

The book which I desire briefly to describe was given by Ken himself to that famous writer, scholar, and good man, Robert Nelson (1656-1715), who was his constant friend. Nelson was a man of constant principles and wide sympathies. His wife was a Roman Catholic. Tillotson, most prominent of Latitudinarians, was his warm friend and died in his arms. He was a staunch Jacobite and Nonjuror, and he even returned to communion with the Church of England by the advice of Ken himself. Probably it was Ken's theology, or steady belief in the doctrine and discipline of the English Church, which most clearly represented his own position.

Like him he might have said: "I die in the holy catholic and apostolic faith, professed by the whole Church before the division of East and West; more particularly I die in the communion of the Church of England, as it stands distinguished from all papal and puritan innovations, and as it adheres to the doctrine of the cross."

The book in my possession has on the title-page the signature



"R. Nelson," with the motto *εὐθυμία καὶ εὐποιία* above the title, and below, "ex dono Authoris. Accepi, legi, probavi," and,

Apud Christianos solœcismus est magnus et vitium turpe quid vel narrare vel facere.—ST. IREN.: *Contr. Heres.*

On the right-hand side is written:

Placet suapte natura adeoque gratiosa virtus est ut insitum etiam sit malis probare meliores.—SEN.: *de Gen.*, l. 4.

Non mihi est vita mea utilior, quam animi talis affectio, neminem ut violem, commodi mei gratia.—CIC.: *de off.*, l. 3.

Quibus nihil est opis in ipsis ad bene beateque vivendum, iis omnis cetas gravis est.—CIC.: *de Senect.*

Ut Adolescentem in quo aliquid senile: sic senem in quo aliquid est Adolescentis probo.—CIC.: *de Senect.*

Tantum manet quod vitute et recte factis sis consecutus.—*Ibid.*

On the left-hand side is written:

Ut quisquis est vir optimus, ita difficillime esse alios improbos suspicatur.—CIC.: *ad L. fratrem.*

All this is in the clear and precise handwriting of Nelson himself, and, I am inclined to judge from the character of the ink, was written at the same time. It is very likely that Nelson began to annotate the book as soon as he received it. He probably continued to do so till very shortly before his death, which occurred on January 16, 1715. His last manuscript entry in the book records the death of Queen Anne:

Queen Anne died at Kensington the 1st August, 1714, and was buried in Westminster on St Bartholomew's day following.

This is on the last page of the Epistle Dedicatory, and at the bottom of that page are these words:

This Learned and Pious Author, Bishop Ken, my worthy Friend, died at Long Leat, 29th March, 1711 and was according to his own directions buried in ye church yard of Frome, as the nearest place in his diocese to w<sup>ch</sup> he died.

On the first inside fly-leaf, in a much later and uneducated hand, late eighteenth or even nineteenth century, are the words "Catechism Book, Rochdale."

On the text of the book there are very few manuscript notes, and those only record the changes made since the first edition. But there are several in the margins of the Epistle Dedicatory, and on five introductory and concluding fly-leaves are a great number, which were evidently written at different times. One, on the inside of the last cover, is clearly autobiographical. It runs thus:



Rome 1<sup>st</sup> January 1688 $\theta$  decli— 21 15

altitude— 27 0

48 15

90

latitude 41 45

 $\frac{22}{12}$  ditto $\theta$  decli— 19 45

alti— 28 30

48 15

90

41 45

Nelson, who left England with his wife after the Revolution of 1688, and resided for a while at Florence, was certainly at Rome on the date given. It is possible that there also he made another, one of his few historical notes, which is written at the side of the same leaf:

*Corvini Regis Hungarorum Epitaphius.*

Corvini brevis haec urna est, q̄ magna fatentur,  
Facta fuisse deum, fata fuisse hominem.

Matthias Corvinus, the stalwart opponent of the Turks, and the conqueror of Vienna and Lower Austria, died in 1690. Why did Robert Nelson take an interest in him?

Of personal interest also are the two prayers, very beautiful, I think. I do not know if Nelson composed them himself, but I am inclined to think he did. They are worth printing verbatim. To each is added a motto, not specially relevant, but showing that Nelson used this gift of his honoured friend not only for his prayers, but also as a sort of commonplace book.

## A SHORT PRAYER FOR THE MORNING.

Almighty & Eternall God, who hast created me after thine own image & likeness & hast made me capable of loving thee and enjoying thee eternally. I adore thee in all humility as my soveran Lord. Give me I beseech thee such a sense of thine infinite goodness as to return to thee all possible love & obedience.

O my God upon whom all things depend, I acknowledge I have nothing but what is the effect of thy bounty, bless the Lord therefore O my soul and declare his loving kindness to all generations. I humbly & heartily thank thee for all the graces & favours thou hast bestowed upon me, particularly for making me a member of the Catholick Church, for preserving me this night & the rest of my life, from innumerable accidents & dangers—



I most humbly O God implore thy pardon & mercy thro' Jesus Christ thy only son our Lord. I am heartily sorry y<sup>t</sup> I have offended thee, I detest my sins because they displease thee who art infinite Goodness—I am resolved by the assistance of thy grace, not to return any more to folly but to avoid all occasions of evill & to live better for the time to come—I dedicate to thee my body & soul & all y<sup>t</sup> I am & because the weakness of my nature can doe nothing without thee, assist me I beseech y<sup>ee</sup> by thy grace, y<sup>t</sup> all that I shall do & Suffer this day, may tend to thy glory & y<sup>e</sup> salvation of my own soul—

Defend me this day by thy Almighty power from sin & danger, grant that all my thoughts words & actions may be soe guided by thy Spirit as to be acceptable in thy sight thro' Jesus Christ our L<sup>d</sup> who has taught me when I pray to say Our Father, &c—

Occasiones hominem fragilem non faciunt  
Sed qualis sit ostendunt.

#### FOR THE EVENING.

I adore thee O God who art present all this time I praise thee I love thee I acknowledge thee as the father of mercy & the fountain of all goodness, I heartily thank thee through Jesus Christ thy only son our L<sup>d</sup> for all the effects of thy love & kindness towards me.

My GOD with all humility I beg thy mercy and forgiveness thro' thy son Jesus Xt: our Lord. I am heartily sorry that I have offended thee, I abhor my sins because they displease y<sup>ee</sup> who art infinite goodness. I solemnly promise by the help of Thy grace, not to commit them any more to avoid the occasions & to live better for the time to come.

Deal not w<sup>th</sup> me O GOD according to my sins neither reward me according to my iniquities but showre on me the effects of thy unspeakable mercy; deliver me from those punishm<sup>ts</sup> I have deserved, from all evill & mischeif, from the snares of the devil, from my own evill inclinations & from sudden death & having bestowed on me the grace of true repentance grant y<sup>t</sup> I may persevere in obedience to thee all the days of my life.

Teach me to be always on my gaurd & watch w<sup>th</sup>out ceasing, because my enemy the devil goes up & down like a roaring lion, seeking whom he may devour, give me strength O L<sup>d</sup> to resist him, & to continue firm in thy holy faith.

Visit, O God, this habitation & keep att a distance from me all the snares of my enemy, the devil. Let thy holy Angells preserve me in safety & let thy blessing alwaies rest upon me, thro' Jesus C: our L<sup>d</sup> in whose name conclude my imperfect devotions saying Our Father, &c.

Nihil est quod minus ferendum sit quam rationem ab altero vitae  
exposcere eum qui non possit suae reddere.—*Cic. Divi: in Quin. Caecili.*

For the rest, the closely written fly leaves are covered with quotations. Most of these can be traced to their sources, even when Nelson has not given a reference. One of them,

Nec prius in dulcem declinent lumina somnum  
Omnia quam longi reputaveris acta diei,



is a version of what I think was a contemporary "tag," for it only differs in a few words from lines painted, with other appropriate words of piety, a crucifix, and other decorations, on a bedroom (possibly used in old times, as by me, for an oratory) in the Great House, Burford, Oxfordshire, where I lived from 1892 to 1911. The house was built c. 1690. I am sorry to say that, since I left, the whole room, with its most interesting decorations, has been repainted, obliterating all the inscriptions.

The commonplace book, which these pages practically form, is interesting, I think, chiefly as showing what authors, and chiefly classical authors, were read by the well-educated laity of the later Stewart age. A few are not identified by me or the kind friend who has helped me, but among those that we know, with or without Nelson's reference, are several from Cicero, a good number from Horace—who was a favourite, one may note, of Ken's, for among his poems are several "imitations," and in his library, still at Longleat, are thirteen editions of the poet—Tacitus, Terence, Seneca (plentifully), Cæsar, Virgil, Aulus Gellius, Pliny.

Among the Greeks are Euripides, Aristotle, Pindar, Demosthenes, Plato, Strabo.

Among the Fathers of the Church, St. Chrysostom, St. Jerome, St. Augustine, St. Ambrose, St. Bernard, Tertullian.

Among modern authors, that extremely popular poem, which "no gentleman's library" for at least a hundred years was without, the "Pastor Fido," and Bacon.

This is not a complete list, but a very good one it is. Nelson evidently "kept up his classics," and as he reread them jotted down some wise saws which supported the virtue and piety of Ken. They seem to me extremely well chosen, and to form a catena of evidence of the experience and the methods of all seekers after God. Two, not that they are better than others, but from their difference of interest, I will quote:

Accipe quotidie quod quotidie tibi prosit: sic vive ut quotidie merearis accipere: qui non meretur quotidie accipere, non meretur post annum accipere.—[St. AMBRO.: *de Sacram.*, lib. 5, cap. 4.]

And then:

ἀμφότερον βασιλεύς τ' ἀγαθός κρατερός τ' αἰχμητής.

Hunc verum omnibus Iliado anteferrendum esse judicabat Alesander. [Where does this come from?]

So I part from this little treasure, which enshrines the good thoughts of two good men. Ken for a long time lived only a few yards away from where I write, and Nelson's *Festivals and Fasts* is one of the memories of my childhood. There could be no two better examples of the English Bishop and the English layman.

W. H. HUTTON.



## CISALPINISM \*

"We acknowledge no infallibility in the Pope." It is startling to be reminded that practically the whole Roman Catholic community in this country were signatories to this declaration in the year 1789. No doubt the statement is capable of a gloss, and even needs one. It is part of a document drawn up by laymen: theological professors would have been more cautious. True, it was signed by the theologians, but they might perhaps plead that it was a political document and signed by them as such: it was in no sense a theological definition. The political point was merely to assure their Protestant fellow-countrymen that they did not feel an obligation of conscience to obey any and every command of the Pope, supposing it contravened their civil duties. Were such a command to be given, they held themselves at liberty to say that the Pope was *mistaken*, and that they could not obey. Also, and this perhaps need hardly be said, the word "infallibility" had not yet fully hardened into a technical theological term. Doubtless the Vicars Apostolic, if pressed, could have said that the "Protestation," of which these words formed part, clearly only dealt with a supposed claim of personal inerrancy which would compel a loyal Roman Catholic to obey the Pope's lightest wish without question. It might seem a truism to say that in this sense he was not infallible. Indeed, the "Catholic Committee" themselves state in their "letter to the Catholics of England" that by the Pope's infallibility they mean "his personal infallibility independently of the general body of the Church," an opinion which, they say, "once had many advocates . . . and some it still has, in parts beyond the Alps."† In this sense, no doubt, the statement can be squared with the *non ex consensu ecclesiae* of the Vatican decrees.

But when all this is said, it remains true that the blunt statement bears witness to a state of mind curiously different from modern Romanism. The difference is twofold. On the one hand, there is a certain independence of spirit, a nationalism, a *ton laïque*, which seems to have disappeared altogether from the general body of English Roman Catholics. (Miss Petre herself is perhaps one of the last representatives of this frame of mind. Another, on the high philosophical level, was the late Baron von Hügel.) On the other hand, we cannot help feeling at every turn the nervous desire to prove that Roman supremacy is not a political danger. From our modern standpoint it almost seems as though the "Protesting Catholics"

\* *The Ninth Lord Petre, or Pioneers of Roman Catholic Emancipation.* By his great-great-granddaughter, M. D. Petre. S.P.C.K. 10s. 6d. net. † P. 199.



protested too much. We have to remind ourselves that only a generation back there had been the possibility of a Roman Catholic King. Romanism was still connected in the popular mind with plots, risings, and political intrigue. It is difficult for us to put ourselves back into the state of mind when it was necessary for Roman Catholics to give assurances that they did not consider themselves justified in assassinating the Sovereign. The frank acknowledgment that the Pope has no civil jurisdiction was still a new thing, and the upholding of this position was not the obvious thing that it is today. After all, it was true that the Fourth Lateran Council, Ecumenical from the Papal point of view, had claimed that the Pope had the power to depose a secular Sovereign: Pius V. had actually put the claim in force against Elizabeth, had dispensed her subjects from their allegiance and released them from their oaths; Sixtus V. had blessed the Armada, and had urged his English spiritual subjects to take part with Spaniards; Cardinal Allen had echoed his admonition; after the Gunpowder Plot Paul V. had refused to allow an oath to be taken which included the statement that an excommunicated prince might not be murdered or deposed by his subjects. It would, indeed, be monstrously untrue to suggest that the Jacobite risings, led as they were by Scottish Episcopalians, depended on any such doctrines as these. On the contrary, the Jacobite contention was that James and Charles were already the lawful Kings of England and Scotland. But for all that the Romanism of these two princes could not but infuse a certain religious tinge into the political strife carried on in their names. Moreover, at any date up to 1870 the *de facto* autocracy of the Popes was a very different thing from what it became in that fateful year. Its political importance was as vastly greater as its spiritual sway was less.

Miss Petre's book is not very well arranged. Perhaps it suffers from too many documents quoted *in extenso*. One or two appendices would have made for easier reading. But it is a vivid sketch of the period of Catholic Emancipation and of the chief actors in that drama, and students of religious history have good cause to be grateful to its gifted authoress.

It cannot have been a pleasant task to expose so ruthlessly the bitter quarrels by which so good a cause was marred. For a good cause it certainly was. It is difficult for us to realize the severity of the penal laws up to 1789. By the letter of these enactments it would hardly be an exaggeration to say that Roman Catholics were outlaws. An English-born Roman Catholic priest coming into England for the exercise of priestly duties was guilty of high treason. It was impossible for Roman



Catholics to have their children educated as Roman Catholics in England, and if they sent them abroad they could be fined £100; and such children were incapable of holding property. There was a fine of £200 for saying the Latin Mass, and of £100 for hearing it. A "Popish Recusant," if convicted of not attending his parish church, could be fined £20 a month, deported from the country, and put to death if he returned. He could not sue at law, be an executor or a guardian, practise law or medicine, or travel more than five miles without permission. He could not take civil or military office or sit in Parliament without receiving Holy Communion according to the Anglican rite, and making declarations contrary to what he believed to be Catholic doctrine.\*

In fact, however, it was long since these had been put in force in full severity, and now, with the disappearance of active Jacobitism, the Roman Catholic community could no longer be thought of as a danger to the established Government. Certainly it did not think of itself in this way. Miss Petre's description of her ancestor's preparations for a visit from George III. are evidence of the fact that a leading Roman Catholic layman was able to pay him a veneration very different from the attitude of those who had considered his *de facto* predecessors to be mere usurpers. All seemed ripe, therefore, for the undoing of a great wrong: and all possible justification for that wrong had certainly disappeared.

It was natural that the movement for emancipation should be chiefly in lay hands, and at first it seemed as though the ecclesiastics were willing to allow the laity to manage the affair for them. A Catholic Committee was formed. A form of oath was devised after consultation with the Vicars Apostolic which could be taken without qualms of conscience, and the Relief Act of 1778, paltry and grudging as it was, did at least grant an indirect toleration to adherents of the Pope. Roman priests and teachers could no longer be prosecuted as such, and the laity were no longer liable to lifelong imprisonment or incapable of holding property.

The Act was followed, as is well known, by the fanatical No Popery riots, during the course of which Roman Catholics found themselves in far greater danger to life and limb than their generation had ever been under the lax administration of the anti-Papal laws. A not unnatural result was the creation, as Miss Petre points out, "in the minds of some Catholics" of "a dread of fresh legislation in their favour, lest it should result in a repetition of like horrors."†

From this point we have to observe a parting of the ways. But it must not be supposed that the long and bitter disputes

\* Chap. vii.

† P. 108.



which now ensued were occasioned merely by difference of opinion in a matter of policy. The relaxation of the heavy external pressure to which Roman Catholics had been subjected revealed a fundamental difference of spirit between the hierarchy and the lay leaders who formed the Catholic Committee. Not, indeed, that the more liberal spirit was entirely confined to the laity. Miss Petre's description of the opinions of the Rev. Alexander Geddes,\* for example, makes one wonder in what sense he could be called a *Roman Catholic* at all. "We acknowledge," he says, "no jurisdiction in the Pope, but pay him that respect which is due to him as a foreign Sovereign and a foreign Bishop." Again: "I have only to regret that, in England, a Prelate should be under the necessity of calling himself Bishop by the grace of the Apostolic See. It is a flagrant innovation." He even went so far as to insist on attending Presbyterian services when he thought good. Certainly he was suspended, and lived and died under censure; but it does not seem that he was actually excommunicated, and he certainly received the Sacraments on his death-bed, and apparently made no retractation of his opinions. Geddes was no doubt an extreme case, but he was not alone in feeling a profound dissatisfaction with the way in which the cause of the Papacy had been upheld. "Men like Petre," says his descendant, "were in such a post-war phase as we have all lately experienced: inclined to see faults in the cause for which they had made such sacrifices, and more than inclined not to make such sacrifices again if they could be avoided."†

Thus we get the Cisalpine party, on the one hand, and the Transalpine or Ultramontane party on the other. At first the difference between them had been political, the Transalpines attributing to the Pope a certain world-wide temporal power, and the Cisalpines confining his authority to things spiritual. As time went on it was agreed on all hands to drop the explicit claim to depose heretical Sovereigns and absolve their subjects from allegiance, and the difference of spirit now showed itself in the doctrinal sphere. To the Transalpine the Pope's supremacy is immediate, active, and personal, as it has now been defined by the Vatican Council, although, as is well known, the decrees of that Council do not go so far as the extreme Ultramontanes of the nineteenth century would have wished. The Cisalpine view is less familiar, and may be set forth at greater length in the words of Charles Butler, the great lawyer whom Miss Petre calls the "big brain" of the Emancipation Movement.‡

"The *Cisalpines* affirm that, in spirituals, the Pope is subject, in doctrine and discipline, to the Church, and to a general council representing her; that he is subject to the Canons of

\* Chap. v.

† P. 324.

‡ P. 13.



the Church, and cannot, except in an extreme case, dispense with them; that even in such a case his dispensation is subject to the judgment of the Church; that the Bishops derive their jurisdiction from God Himself immediately, and not derivatively through the Pope; that he has no right to confer bishoprics, or other spiritual benefices of any kind, the patronage of which by common right, prescription, *concordat*, or any other general rule of the Church, is vested in another. They admit that an appeal lies to the Pope from the sentence of the metropolitan; but assert that no appeal lies to the Pope, and that he can evoke no cause to himself, during the intermediate process. They affirm that a general council may, without and even against the Pope's own consent, reform the Church. They deny his personal infallibility, and hold that he may be deposed by the Church or a general council, for heresy or schism; and they admit that, in an extreme case, where there is a great division of opinion, an appeal lies from the Pope to a future general council."\*

It is not surprising that such opinions were not conducive to an easy submission to the wishes of the hierarchy on matters which seemed political rather than spiritual. The actual disputes did not really turn on the distinction between Cisalpine and Transalpine opinion. They were rather between the clerical mind, which naturally concentrates on opportunities for worship and religious training, and is prone to intensive culture, and the lay mind, which desires a civic outlet and is disposed to undervalue the niceties of theology. Thus it came about that while the whole Roman Catholic body was prepared to sign the famous Protestation, which was to pave the way to further relaxations of the penal laws, the clerical party did so without enthusiasm, feeling that they had gained most of what they wanted, and sensing grave danger in too rapid reconciliation with a Protestant State. When they found that their action seemed to involve all Roman Catholics in the necessity of confirming by oath what they had merely asserted in the Protestation, and when, moreover, they found that the new Relief Bill described them as "Protesting Catholic Dissenters," they promptly began to evade the consequences of their own possibly precipitate action.

Miss Petre seems able to show that the Catholic Committee acted with all due regard to ecclesiastical propriety. They were by no means anxious to accept the proposal of a new oath. When it was made clear to them by the Government that they could not secure their liberties without it, they submitted it to the ecclesiastical members of their own body, who included Bishop Talbot, "Mr. James Talbot" in the approved Catholic phraseology of the period, himself one of the Vicars Apostolic. The Bishop reported that he could find nothing in it contrary

\* Pp. 302, 303.



to faith or morals. In the event, however, the oath was condemned by all four Vicars. Certainly "Protesting Catholic Dissenters" has an ugly sound, but as the phrase was merely embodied in the Relief Bill as a Protestant description of the legal status of "Papists," and was not embodied in the oath which they were to be called upon to take, one might have supposed that it would have been possible to accept it as a mere case of hard words which did not threaten to break any bones. The real objection to the term, in Miss Petre's opinion, was that it implied a distinction between those who were willing to "protest" their abhorrence of certain doctrines falsely attributed to Roman Catholics, and other non-protesting "Papists" who were being thrown to the wolves.\* But a sufficient answer to this seems to be the fact that the whole body of English Romanists were apparently willing to "protest," and that therefore there was no one who could in fact complain that he was being deserted. The oath committed no one to anything more than he had already assented to in the Protestation. Indeed, it seems to have been impossible to elicit from the hierarchy exactly what their objections to the oath consisted in, unless, indeed, we are to take seriously the unfortunate statement of Bishop Milner that "conscientious Catholics made a great difference between a declaration to their fellow-creatures and an oath made to God."†

In the end the Relief Bill was rejected by the House of Commons; but the divisions in the Roman Catholic body occasioned by it were destined to continue until at last the laity of the old Roman Catholic families were swamped by the new converts of the nineteenth century, with their characteristic convert mentality, and Cisalpinism came to the ground everywhere, as far as spiritual things were concerned, before the shock of the Vatican Council.

In conclusion, it will be of interest to draw attention to one or two further points in this most illuminating book.

It is well known that there had been no fully organized hierarchy in communion with Rome in this country since the accession of Elizabeth. The Roman Catholic community was governed direct from Rome by means of Vicars Apostolic, appointed by the absolute *fiat* of the Pope and exercising simply a delegated authority. It will also be remembered with what anger the establishment of regular diocesan Bishops in 1850 was received by those who dreaded the influence of the Vatican. It is therefore worth noticing that the strongly Cisalpine Catholic Committee, on purely civil grounds, desired nothing more than the abolition of the system of delegated authority and the restoration of a regular hierarchy. "They stated that the system . . . gave an appearance of unlimited dependence on

\* P. 198.

† P. 289.



the See of Rome which . . . made a bad impression on the English Government." "They complain that they are governed . . . by superiors . . . who are appointed by the court of Rome without any election of the clergy or laity." The system "is not only contrary to the primitive practice of the Church," but is in direct opposition to the "Statutes of Præmunire and Provisors." They speak of "the advantage which would result from having pastors chosen by the flock they are to teach and direct."\*

Further, when in the year 1790 two vacancies occurred in the numbers of the Vicars Apostolic and the clergy of the London district sent up three names to Propaganda, Mr. John Throckmorton wrote a "Letter to the Catholic Clergy of England" in which he urges that it is contrary to ecclesiastical law to submit such a matter to a foreign prelate! Finally, when it was settled that the wishes of the London clergy were to be ignored, Lord Petre actually wished that "Mr. Thomas Talbot" should be persuaded to decline to lay hands on "a man so forced upon his flock."† It all sounds strangely like the Church of England.

Another point of special interest to ourselves is the view which the Cisalpines seem to have taken of the Anglican Episcopate. In a letter from Lord Petre to the Bishop of St. David's, in which he asserts the unanimity with which Roman Catholics acknowledge the Bishop of Rome to be the first Bishop of the Catholic Church, he continues: "Through the medium of which See your Lordship derives your ordination equally with the clergy of our religion,"‡ a remark which might well set us all thinking. Further, in 1791 the ultra-clerical (though not Ultramontane) Bishop Milner was carried so far by the vehemence of his dislike for proposals hatched in a lay nest that he actually appealed to the Archbishop of Canterbury to oppose the Relief Bill of that year, and so to vindicate the rights of Episcopacy.§

It is all rather a sad story, and points a very clear moral against the ingrained quarrelsomeness of religious people. No one can say that our trumpets give an uncertain sound, but it is often a very discordant one. The Roman Church of the nineteenth century chose one way to peace, the way of autocratic rule. That is a possible solution, though we may doubt if it is the best one. It is not for Anglicans to throw stones: but perhaps it may yet be reserved for us, along our traditional lines of tolerant evolution, to harmonize those competing loyalties which are the real ground of our divisions.

K. D. MACKENZIE.

\* Pp. 122, 125.

† Pp. 204, 210.

‡ P. 112.

§ P. 236.



## MISCELLANEA

### NOTES AND COMMENTS

THE Editor will be absent from England on a visit to America from May 30 to July 6. Dr. Lowther Clarke has kindly agreed to see the July number through the press, and to deal with any correspondence relating to the Journal during the Editor's absence.

We have received a copy of one of the Scottish Churchman's Tracts entitled *The Presbyterate*, by George Douglas (The Scottish Chronicle Press, 3d. net). It gives a compact and able review of the origins of the Christian Ministry, and is to be warmly commended to any who may be in doubt as to its nature and authority. The local character of the presbyterate and its subordination to the Apostolic office is especially well brought out.

On p. 283, l. 22, of our last issue, the Old Catholic Theological Faculty was spoken of as "at Rome." This was an error for "at Berne."

### NOTES

#### 1. "SUFFERING AND GOD": A NOTE ON BARON VON HÜGEL'S TREATISE\*

It seems the height of presumption to criticize anything written by that great intellect and devout soul, Friedrich von Hügel. Yet each one must make his contribution to truth as it is given him; and von Hügel, in his genuine humility, would be the first to acknowledge it. Of this profound study on "Suffering and God," I propose to criticize, not the conclusion, which I believe to be true, but an antecedent of the conclusion, which I hold to be untenable; and then to bring to bear another truth which will, I think, be found to revalidate the conclusion he comes to, that there is no Suffering in God.

I will, however, first make a preliminary criticism which is merely verbal, but not on that account unimportant. Von Hügel claims, and somewhat insistently, that Suffering is an Evil. The same expression has been used by Canon Streeter (in *Reality*) and by other recent writers. But real Evil—moral Evil—is so entirely *sui generis* that nothing but confusion can result from applying the same term, Evil, to Error or to Suffering, which are, if you like, Ills, but are totally distinct from moral Evil. Moreover, what is there in common between a wrong act of the will, which is what we mean by moral Evil, and a state of mental or physical endurance, in which the will usually has no part, which is what we mean by Suffering? To use the word Evil of both seems always to tend either to a condonation of moral Evil, or to the affixing of almost a moral taint to Suffering. So here, the claim that "Suffering is intrinsically an Evil" is the first of von Hügel's seven reasons for denying that Suffering can exist in God.

Von Hügel's conclusion (with which, as I have said, I fully agree) is that there is no Suffering in God; as against the position taken by James Hinton, and, among more recent writers, by William Temple and W. H.

\* *Essays and Addresses on the Philosophy of Religion*, second series (Dent.).



Moberly. But he states it thus: "there is Sympathy in God, but no Suffering"; "there is Suffering in Christ, but as Man, not as God" (p. 205); "'without Suffering' is true even for the Divinity of Jesus Christ" (p. 208). Now this statement appears to me not only to approach but to reach, though unintentionally, the Nestorian view of our Lord's Personality. Two separate consciousnesses, one of which is suffering and the other not, imply two persons. Christ is one Person, with one consciousness acting through two instruments, His Divine infinite mind and His Human finite mind (finite, but within its limits perfect). And if we follow the guidance of that most valuable phrase of the Athanasian Creed which represents the Incarnation as "the taking of the Manhood into God," we conceive of these two mental instruments as not side by side, but as the one within the other. I like to compare it to an earthenware pipe introduced into the torrent of Niagara, that torrent, however, being thought of as not merely vast but infinite. If this is, as I believe, involved in the single personality of Christ, then it follows surely that His Human experience was the experience of God the Son, His Human Suffering, mental and physical, the Suffering of God the Son.

Further, there is one branch of Suffering to which von Hügel has not alluded. It seems natural to many of us to speak of having grieved God by our sins. Would von Hügel have said that this was an illegitimate expression, based on a false conception? It is the case, I believe, that no such expression as God's grief over sin occurs in the New Testament, though His joy over the penitent is spoken of; but in the Old Testament similar statements are to be found; and it is difficult to think that sin does not grieve God.

We have apparently, then, in these two respects been led to the opposite conclusion to that of von Hügel. Here, however, I would bring in the undoubted truth of the timelessness of God, the simultaneity (as von Hügel would have called it) of His consciousness. What are to us past, present, and future, are present together in God's consciousness. Hence the Sufferings of the Incarnate Son are present only along with His Resurrection and present Glory; "death is swallowed up in victory," sorrow is lost in joy, as darkness in light. The same principle applies, though not so simply, to the grief caused by sin. Whether the sinner repents or not, the sin is present to the mind of God only along with the most loving Reparation made for it by the perfect obedience and voluntary Passion of the representative Man. If the sinner becomes a penitent, the grief occasioned by his sin is swallowed up in the simultaneous joy of his repentance and sanctification. If he remains impenitent, we can reverently conceive the deep regret of God on the lost one's own account, tempered by the consciousness that He has done all that could be done to save him; but if we believe, as we do, that God created creatures not because He needed them to complete His Joy, but in order that they might share in that Joy, the loss of that Joy by any creature through his own perverse choice can cause no gap in the completeness of that Joy which is God's eternally.

G. H. TREMENHEERE.



## 2. THOUGHTS FROM PROFESSOR WHITEHEAD

Professor Whitehead is one of our greatest living thinkers. Mathematician, scientist, philosopher, humanist—his works are the admiration of those who read them. But equally are they the despair of an ordinary priest, so many-sided and abstruse are their arguments. *Science and the Modern World* (2nd edition, Cambridge, 1927) cannot honestly be recommended to the rank and file of our readers; but some of its *dicta* may be useful.

"Science is even more changeable than Theology. No man of science could subscribe without qualification to Galileo's beliefs, or to Newton's beliefs, or to all his own scientific beliefs of ten years ago."

"At the date of Galileo's controversy with the Inquisition, Galileo's way of stating the facts was, beyond question, the fruitful procedure for the sake of scientific research. But in itself it was not more true than the formulation of the Inquisition. At that time the modern concepts of relative motion were in nobody's mind; so that the statements were made in ignorance of the qualifications required for their more perfect truth" (pp. 227, 8).

"We should apply these same principles to the questions in which there is a variance between science and religion. . . . A clash between the two should not lead us hastily to abandon doctrines for which we have solid evidence. . . . If we have any sense of perspective and of the history of thought, we shall wait and refrain from mutual anathemas. We should wait; but we should not wait passively, or in despair" (pp. 228, 9).

"A clash of doctrines is not a disaster—it is an opportunity" (p. 230).

"In formal logic, a contradiction is the signal of a defeat: but in the evolution of real knowledge it marks the first step in progress towards a victory. This is one great reason for the utmost toleration of variety of opinion. Once and for ever, this duty of toleration has been summed up in the words, 'Let both grow together until the harvest.'" (p. 230).

"The religious controversies of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries put theologians into a most unfortunate state of mind. They were always attacking and defending. They pictured themselves as the garrison of a fort surrounded by hostile forces. All such pictures express half-truths. That is why they are so popular. But they are dangerous. This particular picture fostered a pugnacious party spirit which really expresses an ultimate lack of faith" (p. 235).

"Any verbal form of statement which has been before the world for some time discloses ambiguities; and often such ambiguities strike at the very heart of the meaning. The effective sense in which a doctrine has been held in the past cannot be determined by the mere logical analysis of verbal statements, made in ignorance of the logical trap" (p. 237).

"The power of God is the worship He inspires. That religion is strong which in its ritual and its modes of thought evokes an apprehension of the commanding vision. The worship of God is not a rule of safety—it is an adventure of the spirit, a flight after the unattainable. The death of religion comes with the repression of the high hope of adventure" (p. 239).

These quotations come from the chapter on Science and Religion. We take a few sentences from the concluding chapter on Social Progress.



"Almost equally dangerous [as the Gospel of Force] is the Gospel of Uniformity. . . . Men require of their neighbours something sufficiently akin to be understood, something sufficiently different to provoke attention, and something great enough to command admiration. We must not expect, however, all the virtues." (p. 258).

"In the immediate future there will be less security than in the immediate past, less stability. It must be admitted that there is a degree of instability which is inconsistent with civilisation. But, on the whole, the great ages have been unstable ages" (p. 259).

Professor Whitehead is writing about the conflict between Science, which for practical purposes largely means professionalism, specialization and technology, and the moral and æsthetic values of "religion." But his words are applicable to the continuing crisis of Anglicanism. The Anglican Communion in God's providence has become the most unstable community in Christendom. It is the spiritual home of those whose eyes are set on modern thought and largely closed to traditional values; of those who cling to the New Testament and demand a simplification of religion which hardly corresponds with facts; of those who feel closest spiritual affinity with the massive loyalties of Latin and Oriental Christendom. Nor should we forget those in the provinces of Canterbury and York who see their Church mainly as the spiritual expression of a nation's soul. We all recognize the dangers we are in by our divisions. Instability may reach a degree which is inconsistent with our continued existence. But, short of that, there is an instability, a clash, which is "not a disaster but an opportunity," just because it avoids premature simplification and allows elbow-room for the inevitable complexity of religious problems in the modern world. We have undertaken the adventure of living together—"an adventure of the spirit" indeed, not, let us hope, "a flight after the unattainable."

It may almost be claimed that the essence of "loyal Anglicanism" is not the *Via Media*, as was thought a generation ago, but the acceptance of the limitations, even humiliations, of this living together, and the seizing of its accompanying opportunities.

W. K. L. C.

### 3. THE NEW LIDDELL AND SCOTT

The following notes deal with the third fasciculus in so far as it throws light on the New Testament. LS I.=the current edition, LS II.=the new one, AS=Abbott Smith's *Manual Greek Lexicon*, MM=Milligan-Moulton's *Vocabulary*.

διέξοδος (Matt. xxii. 9). R.V. translates "the partings of the highways." LS II. and MM "the issues of the streets," i.e. the main roads out of the town.

διηνεκής. LS II. translates εἰς τὸ διηνεκές in Hebrews by "in perpetuity," the sonorous word happily rendering the Greek phrase peculiar to Heb. in N.T.

ἐμβαρύνω (Col. ii. 18). LS I. does not explain. MM, following Ramsay, "taking his stand on (what he has seen in the mysteries)." LS II., more precisely than the evidence justifies, "be initiated into the mysteries."

ἐνεργέω. Recent commentators render ἐνεργεῖσθαι (Rom. vii. 5 etc.)



as a passive, "set in operation (by a divine force)." LS II. tacitly sets this view aside by taking as a middle in N.T.

*ἐνθύμησις*. AS, following Westcott, says *ἐνθ.* involves the action of the feelings. LS II. does not mention this, rendering "consideration," "reflection," "idea," "conception," etc.

*ἐντός*. In Luke xvii. 21 the word apparently means "in your hearts." The sense required is "in your midst," "amongst you," for Christ could hardly have said that the kingdom of God was in the Pharisees' hearts. LS II. render "in your hearts." None of the new passages quoted supports the required meaning.

W. K. L. C.

### NOTES ON PERIODICALS

*Analecta Bollandiana*. Tom. xlvi., fasc. 1 and 2.

Though one may begin by suspecting this number of dullness, one soon loses that impression. It contains many very important things, and adds considerably to our knowledge of obscure historical points. The reviews are, as usual, most useful, and the work of expert writers; perhaps the most interesting to English readers is a high eulogy of the Dean of Wells. Among the articles there is an exhaustive one by R. Devreesse on the different recensions of the life of S. Maximus (ob. 662) with, *inter alia*, important extracts from Greek authorities. His importance is chiefly connected with (1) the relation between Rome, Constantinople, and Africa, and (2) the later stages of "Mono-energism" and Monothelitism. There are illustrations of it in that important and too much neglected writer, John of Nikiu, of whom the only really sound edition is that by Archdeacon Charles (Oxford, 1916). Then Père Delehaye submits some conclusions as to vexed dates in the Roman Calendar; Parthenius and Calocerus (May 19), S. Vitale, famed at Ravenna (April 28), and S. Soter (February 11). M. Hilka prints a verse record of "L'émouvante légende de Ste. Marine," who for a long time posed as a monk, Marinus. The almost omniscient Père Grosjean gives a most useful account of Latin hagiographical MSS. in Dublin (Trinity, Archbishop Marsh, and Franciscan Libraries), and Père Delehaye continues his form of "collective" indulgences.

W. H. H.

*Zeitschrift für die A. T. liche Wissenschaft*. 1927. Heft 4.

This number is perhaps hardly up to the average for interest. NICOLSKY concludes his article on the Passover, the later history of which reflects the attempts of the priests at Jerusalem to assimilate a family or clan observance to the sacrifices of the sanctuary, and the tenacious popular resistance. W. CASPARI discusses Ps. 50 on the background of its presumed liturgical use. A. SPERBER has a very technical article on the Targums of the Prophets. The O.T. articles in the specialist-periodicals of all countries are logged. A plan is printed for the formation of a German Society of O.T. Study, the proposed objects being: (1) the support of the *Zeitschrift*; (2) the maintenance of the O.T. section of the Orientalist Conference; (3) co-operation with the corresponding British Society; (4) "the repulse of attacks upon the teaching of Hebrew in



Schools and colleges and upon Hebrew as a subject in theological examinations."

W. K. L. C.

*Harvard Theological Review.* January, 1928.

The outstanding feature is the description by K. Lake and R. P. Blake of their visit to the mines of Sinai in search of the Serabit inscriptions. These they found with surprising ease and brought to the Cairo Museum. There follows an essay by Prof. Butin of Washington on their decipherment and meaning. Grimme's discovery of Moses is shown to be an illusion. The script is proto-Semitic and shows us the earliest known stage of the Hebrew alphabet. It is based on Egyptian hieroglyphs and is acrophonic. (A simple illustration will explain this. Suppose that English had first been written down along the lines of the old "alphabet"—"A was an archer that shot at a frog"—the first letter would have been a conventionalised form of an archer). Thus the Hebrew letter 'Ayin, meaning "an eye," is formed in the Sinai-script exactly in the shape of an eye. The date of the inscriptions is c. 1900.

One inscription is rendered thus: "O Ba'alat, kindly answer the sleeps in the structures in which people will have spent the night." Ba'alat is feminine of Ba'al; the goddess is asked to give an answer in a dream during sleep at the sanctuary.

The famous "Moses" inscription is rendered, with diffidence: "M-SH, head of the stele-setters, has erected this libation-altar; arise, now, O Ba'alat . . . the brother of the prince (of thy devotee) . . . M-SH. . ."

W. K. L. C.

*Blackfriars.* April, 1928.

A remarkable article by Father Pope, O.P., entitled "Protestant—not Catholic" deserves attention, for it launches the bitterest possible attack upon Anglicanism. When a clergyman of the Church of England asks people to adore the Body and Blood of Christ, "is it so certain that It is there present? For so stupendous an act as adoration we need the most absolute guarantees. What guarantee is forthcoming? . . . It is far more probable then that any such act of adoration is objectively idolatrous and that a minister asking his people to adore is knowingly asking them to commit what is probably an act of idolatry. The same must apply to any attempt at absolving people from their sins."

Curiously enough, on the same page there is a poem by Father Vincent McNabb, containing these lines:

Say not, my child, in mood of dark despair:  
"Can'st Thou, O Lord, but hear, not answer Prayer?  
Or is Thy plighted word as empty air?"

\* \* \* \* \*

Anglicans differ as to the mode of the Presence, but they are agreed in trusting the "plighted word" of "there am I in the midst of them" taken together with "This is My Body, My Blood."

W. K. L. C.



*The British Museum Quarterly.* Vol. ii., Nos. 3 and 4.

Of special interest in these attractive numbers are the following: (1) A note with illustrations of two gold medallions of Constantine Chlorus (d. 306 A.D.) on which is the inscription *PIETAS AUGG[USTORUM]*, "the compassion of the Augusti," an uncommon use in good Latin of *pietas* in the sense of pity or clemency. (2) A further account, fully illustrated, of Mr. Woolley's remarkable discoveries at Ur of the Chaldees of two royal tombs of the fourth millennium B.C., both littered with the slain household, women, children, and soldiers. Among the slain were found many valuable objects—a wooden harp covered with silver and gold, the instrument of the royal harpist who was killed and buried there; a chariot of wood, with bands of mosaic and heads of lions and bulls in silver and gold; a model of a boat in silver, complete with oars and awning support, and other priceless treasures. Many of the finds will be on view at the Museum this summer. (3) A note, also illustrated, on a series of wall paintings from Tell al-'Amarna recently acquired by the Museum. The paintings, which are on mud plaster, are handsome designs chiefly of wild fowl and plants, and date from about 1370 B.C. The largest comes from a palace, other fragments come from private houses, illustrating the normal scheme of decoration in a middle-class house on the Nile in the fourteenth century B.C.

R. D. M.

*Zeitschrift für die N.T. liche Wissenschaft.* 1927. Heft 2-4.

Three of the four yearly parts are united in this important number. SALONIUS prints and comments on MS. fragments of the Greek N.T. in the Berlin Museum. W. E. CRUM writes on the Coptic translation of the life of Simeon Stylites. An exceptionally clear and interesting article by L. BRUN discusses the Emperors referred to in the Apocalypse. He concludes that the *terminus ad quem* must be Domitian, in whose reign the Apocalypse was written. The Seven Heads of xvii. are Caligula, Claudius, Nero, Vespasian, Titus, Domitian and "Nero Redivivus"; the Ten Horns of xiii. are Cæsar, Augustus, Tiberius, and the other seven as above. The great attractiveness of the theory is that the enumeration is either from Julius Cæsar, the most natural beginning, or from Caligula, who was probably the first Emperor to be identified with Antichrist, owing to his attempt to place his image in the Temple and his reign of (a little over) 3½ years. LOHMEYER studies the introductory formulas of the Pauline Epistles. They are not specifically Pauline, certainly not Hellenic, for their elaboration contrasts with Hellenic conciseness; rather they are Oriental in tone and reflect the liturgical formulas of the earliest Christian community. C. CLEMEN gives good grounds for thinking that the Apocalypse represents the views of a small circle within early Christendom, just as the Jewish Apocalypses are stoutly maintained by Jewish scholars to be out of the main stream of Judaism. This explains why the attitude towards the Roman Empire is unique in the N.T., and the difficulty with which the book won canonicity. H. WINDISCH discusses the theory that *iva* in the later *Koiné* is causal, not final, and finds only one place in the N.T. where it probably applies—Apoc. xxii. 14. Other articles deal with the Mandæans and the Fourth Gospel, Iranian and Jewish Religion, the Elder John at Jerusalem, etc.

A genuine surprise is afforded by a Greek scholar's (J. Sykutris) dis-



Schools and colleges and upon Hebrew as a subject in theological examinations."

W. K. L. C.

*Harvard Theological Review.* January, 1928.

The outstanding feature is the description by K. Lake and R. P. Blake of their visit to the mines of Sinai in search of the Serabit inscriptions. These they found with surprising ease and brought to the Cairo Museum. There follows an essay by Prof. Butin of Washington on their decipherment and meaning. Grimme's discovery of Moses is shown to be an illusion. The script is proto-Semitic and shows us the earliest known stage of the Hebrew alphabet. It is based on Egyptian hieroglyphs and is acrophonic. (A simple illustration will explain this. Suppose that English had first been written down along the lines of the old "alphabet"—"A was an archer that shot at a frog"—the first letter would have been a conventionalised form of an archer). Thus the Hebrew letter 'Ayin, meaning "an eye," is formed in the Sinai-script exactly in the shape of an eye. The date of the inscriptions is c. 1900.

One inscription is rendered thus: "O Ba'alat, kindly answer the sleeps in the structures in which people will have spent the night." Ba'alat is feminine of Ba'al; the goddess is asked to give an answer in a dream during sleep at the sanctuary.

The famous "Moses" inscription is rendered, with diffidence: "M-SH, head of the stele-setters, has erected this libation-altar; arise, now, O Ba'alat . . . the brother of the prince (of thy devotee) . . . M-SH. . ."

W. K. L. C.

*Blackfriars.* April, 1928.

A remarkable article by Father Pope, O.P., entitled "Protestant—not Catholic" deserves attention, for it launches the bitterest possible attack upon Anglicanism. When a clergyman of the Church of England asks people to adore the Body and Blood of Christ, "is it so certain that It is there present? For so stupendous an act as adoration we need the most absolute guarantees. What guarantee is forthcoming? . . . It is far more probable then that any such act of adoration is objectively idolatrous and that a minister asking his people to adore is knowingly asking them to commit what is probably an act of idolatry. The same must apply to any attempt at absolving people from their sins."

Curiously enough, on the same page there is a poem by Father Vincent McNabb, containing these lines:

Say not, my child, in mood of dark despair:  
"Can'st Thou, O Lord, but hear, not answer Prayer?  
Or is Thy plighted word as empty air?"

\* \* \* \* \*

Anglicans differ as to the mode of the Presence, but they are agreed in trusting the "plighted word" of "there am I in the midst of them" taken together with "This is My Body, My Blood."

W. K. L. C.



*The British Museum Quarterly.* Vol. ii., Nos. 3 and 4.

Of special interest in these attractive numbers are the following: (1) A note with illustrations of two gold medallions of Constantine Chlorus (d. 306 A.D.) on which is the inscription *PIETAS AUGG[USTORUM]*, "the compassion of the Augusti," an uncommon use in good Latin of *pietas* in the sense of pity or clemency. (2) A further account, fully illustrated, of Mr. Woolley's remarkable discoveries at Ur of the Chaldees of two royal tombs of the fourth millennium B.C., both littered with the slain household, women, children, and soldiers. Among the slain were found many valuable objects—a wooden harp covered with silver and gold, the instrument of the royal harpist who was killed and buried there; a chariot of wood, with bands of mosaic and heads of lions and bulls in silver and gold; a model of a boat in silver, complete with oars and awning support, and other priceless treasures. Many of the finds will be on view at the Museum this summer. (3) A note, also illustrated, on a series of wall paintings from Tell al-'Amarna recently acquired by the Museum. The paintings, which are on mud plaster, are handsome designs chiefly of wild fowl and plants, and date from about 1370 B.C. The largest comes from a palace, other fragments come from private houses, illustrating the normal scheme of decoration in a middle-class house on the Nile in the fourteenth century B.C.

R. D. M.

*Zeitschrift für die N.T. liche Wissenschaft.* 1927. Heft 2-4.

Three of the four yearly parts are united in this important number. SALONIUS prints and comments on MS. fragments of the Greek N.T. in the Berlin Museum. W. E. CRUM writes on the Coptic translation of the life of Simeon Stylites. An exceptionally clear and interesting article by L. BRUN discusses the Emperors referred to in the Apocalypse. He concludes that the *terminus ad quem* must be Domitian, in whose reign the Apocalypse was written. The Seven Heads of xvii. are Caligula, Claudius, Nero, Vespasian, Titus, Domitian and "Nero Redivivus"; the Ten Horns of xiii. are Cæsar, Augustus, Tiberius, and the other seven as above. The great attractiveness of the theory is that the enumeration is either from Julius Cæsar, the most natural beginning, or from Caligula, who was probably the first Emperor to be identified with Antichrist, owing to his attempt to place his image in the Temple and his reign of (a little over) 3½ years. LOHMEYER studies the introductory formulas of the Pauline Epistles. They are not specifically Pauline, certainly not Hellenic, for their elaboration contrasts with Hellenic conciseness; rather they are Oriental in tone and reflect the liturgical formulas of the earliest Christian community. C. CLEMEN gives good grounds for thinking that the Apocalypse represents the views of a small circle within early Christendom, just as the Jewish Apocalypses are stoutly maintained by Jewish scholars to be out of the main stream of Judaism. This explains why the attitude towards the Roman Empire is unique in the N.T., and the difficulty with which the book won canonicity. H. WINDISCH discusses the theory that *iva* in the later *Koiné* is causal, not final, and finds only one place in the N.T. where it probably applies—Apoc. xxii. 14. Other articles deal with the Mandæans and the Fourth Gospel, Iranian and Jewish Religion, the Elder John at Jerusalem, etc.

A genuine surprise is afforded by a Greek scholar's (J. Sykutris) dis-



covery of a fragment of Papias, quoted from a Byzantine MS. dated in the reign of Michael VIII (1261-82). Papias is said to have referred to Genoa, which got its name from facing towards Upper and Lower Gaul, *like the doors of Janus*. The passage is corrupt and Papias cannot have referred to Genoa. But the writer seems to have consulted some dictionary and discovered it. The ultimate source will have been Papias' remarks on the Apocalypse. Now Laurentius Lydus (of Philadelphia) in *de Mensis* iv. 2 reports a Janus cult in that city. Janus is represented with a key in his hand and doors are naturally sacred to him. If this combination is correct we see the allusion in Apoc. iii. 7—he that opens and none can shut . . . the open door. Papias will have interposed his explanation: "It is not Janus but I that have the keys," etc.

W. K. L. C.

### *Revue d'Histoire Ecclésiastique.*

The *Revue d'Histoire Ecclésiastique* opens with the concluding article by Father Duhr on the "De Fide" of Bachiarus. It is largely concerned with the doctrines and the tendencies of this writing, and its value is enhanced by the precise fashion in which the author sets alongside parallel passages from Bachiarus and Priscillian. Specially notable is the summary of the attitude of the former to the Trinity, the Incarnation, the Resurrection of the soul, and the nature of man. Here our author once more tries the method of parallel passages, and the divine with whom he compares Bachiarus is Firmicus Maternus. It is quite plain that Bachiarus rejected Manichean, Gnostic, and Origenistic errors, surely a comprehensive list. Nor will Father Duhr allow that Bachiarus was a follower of Priscillian. Father Van der Essen throws light on the religious situation in the Low Countries in 1634, employing as his main authority the disclosures of the nuncio Fabio de Lagonissa. He provides the background, and he adds to our knowledge of a critical situation. Father Martin writes a note on two homilies attributed to Gregory Thaumaturgus. Father Lottin writes a note on the disputed date of the publication of the *De Malo* of St. Thomas Aquinas. He shows that it is anterior to the *Prima Secundæ*, and that it gives us the definitive thought of the Angelic Doctor on questions of fundamental morality. The lists of articles in the leading European quarterlies are as accurate as ever.

R. H. M.



## NOTICES

EUSTATHIUS OF ANTIOCH. By R. V. Sellers, B.D. Cambridge University Press. 8s. 6d.

Antiochene theology appeals by its "modernity"—that is to say, by a balance of interests similar to that which prevails at the present time. Its historical interest also has been enhanced, of late years, first by the discovery of the "Bazaar of Heraclides," and consequent re-examination of the Nestorian question, and more recently through fruitful studies of the affair of Paul of Samosata, which have brought out the fact that there was a distinctive Syrian tradition and point of view at the back of the theology of Antioch, even in its Hellenized forms.

It follows that we should want to know more about other great figures in the Antiochene succession, and most of all about Eustathius, the Bishop of Antioch, who was present at Nicea, "hammer of the Arians," and afterwards victim of Eusebian intrigue.

The scattered and scanty material for such a study was collected by Cavallera in 1905, but his book is out of print, and many of his judgments need revision. And so the work which Mr. Sellers has produced is entirely opportune.

His first four chapters sketch, with admirable clarity and proportion, the rise of "Origenistic" theology, its development by the pupils of Lucian of Antioch, and consequent reactions, one from Alexandria, renewing emphasis upon the doctrine of Eternal Generation, and another from Antioch represented by Eustathius. Any student who has made a first acquaintance with the doctrinal history of this period will find these chapters most instructive. The personal history of Eustathius, and his character as a theologian and exegete, are then admirably set out. So far one can have nothing but praise for the book.

The remaining two chapters deal in detail with the theology and Christology of Eustathius, with ample quotation from the *De engastrimytho* and the fragments. These, too, are good. But it seems to the present reviewer a pity that Mr. Sellers was not content to marshal his evidence and leave the reader to draw his own conclusions. Instead he is at pains to prove Eustathius heterodox, attributing to the Logos no proper hypostasis, and standing but a little way from the position of Paul of Samosata. This involves him in maintaining that Eustathius sought the personality of Christ in "the Man's human soul," in spite of the fact that Eustathius speaks equally of ἡ ἀγία τοῦ Χριστοῦ ψυχὴ, ὁ ἄνθρωπος τοῦ Χριστοῦ, and of τὸ θεῖον τοῦ Χριστοῦ πνεῦμα. He has also to empty of all real meaning such expressions as ἐκ δυνάδος τὴν μίαν θεότητα, and τὴν ἀληθῆ θεογονίαν, and to strain argument to prove purely synonymous words which should convey differing shades of meaning.

But however near Eustathius may be to Paul, there is a grave objection to placing him in an exact line between Paul and Theodore. Eustathius alone in the Antiochene succession was a warm ally of Alexandria and the West. This alliance was perpetuated in the Eustathian schism, while the later development of an Antiochene school lay to one side.

But if the reader hesitates to follow Mr. Sellers here, he has plenty to be grateful for. The book is scholarly, and at the same time is written



in an interesting and readable manner; while the Cambridge University Press has turned the book out in attractive form.

It is a pleasure to welcome, in this book, a "first work" which deserves such a reception as may encourage the production of more.

W. TELFER.

ENGLISH MONUMENTAL SCULPTURE SINCE THE RENAISSANCE. By K. Esdaile. S.P.C.K. 10s. 6d.

Mrs. Esdaile has rendered us a real service. She has spoken a word in season, not before it was time. The advent of a champion for that much-abused epoch, the eighteenth century, has been long overdue.

Most of us have been brought up to believe that everything Gothic—churches, chantries, monuments, tombs, pictures, and everything else—is good, nay superlatively good; that Jacobean art, a wonderfully elastic expression, for that period is not infrequently supposed to commence years before the accession of our first James, is perhaps interesting, while everything else is utterly and abominably bad, only varying in its particular degree of badness. Even the beautiful Cosmati work on the shrine of St. Edward the Confessor, or Abbot Ware's wonderful marble and mosaic pavement in front of the High Altar of Westminster Abbey, though thirteenth-century work, falls somewhat under suspicion, because it does not wholly accord with our own preconceived ideas of what Gothic art ought to be!

As a matter of fact, there is good art and bad art in every period and among every race of mankind. Moreover, there is no absolute fixed standard of what is good or what is bad. The pendulum shifts, as it were, from generation to generation. To draw a fixed and arbitrary line of demarcation between the supposed good and the supposed bad in art is an utterly unhistorical proceeding, and a misleading one into the bargain. However, it was being done with a vengeance throughout nearly the whole of the nineteenth century, and we are only just beginning to wake up to the fact.

The Gothic Revival and its later ally the Oxford Movement, more particularly, have had great and far-reaching effects. Thanks to the influence of John Ruskin and others the scales have been weighted, as it were, against the unfortunate eighteenth century. It is high time for Flaxman, Nollekens, and Chantrey, to mention three names only, to have a reasonable chance. This is one of the objects which Mrs. Esdaile in her interesting volume has set out to attain.

She has managed to pack an enormous amount of information into a compass of considerably less than two hundred pages, and moreover in a delightfully readable form. There is not a dull page in the whole book, and the well-chosen and admirably executed illustrations add immensely to its value.

She commences with a chapter entitled "The Sculptor and his Materials," which will be a veritable revelation to not a few of her readers. The same remark also applies to another chapter, "The Sculptor and the Architect." Perhaps, however, the most valuable chapter of all is that entitled "Neo-Hellenism and the Gothic Revival," in which we learn how utterly the early leaders of the Oxford Movement "failed to realize the unwisdom of a complete breach with tradition." They associated the art of the eighteenth century with the Latitudinarianism



which they loathed with all their souls, and they swept all its monuments without exception beneath the same general ban of condemnation. Mediæval conventions took complete possession of the field, with the result that a sadly large amount of valuable and interesting material was ruthlessly flung upon the scrap-heap. Only within the last quarter of a century or so have we seen the beginning of a healthful reaction, as exemplified by such works of art as the standing monument of Bishop Creighton in St. Paul's Cathedral, and the kneeling figure of Archbishop Temple at Canterbury.

Here and there Mrs. Esdaile has fallen into some slight errors of detail. On p. 91, for instance, she has assigned the expression the "beloved heretic" to Joseph Wilcocks, Dean of Westminster, whereas it should have been that Dean's delightful son, who bore the same Christian name. The Pope alluded to in this connection, moreover, was not Innocent VIII., but Clement XIII., who was a personal friend of the younger Wilcocks.

It seems, however, somewhat captious to criticize comparatively small errors such as these when all else is so good. We can only hope that Mrs. Esdaile will one of these days expand her delightful volume into a still larger treatise. She has thrown a flood of light upon an era which has been shamefully misrepresented and even traduced, and our best thanks are due to her for her timely effort.

JOCELYN PERKINS.

---

LUTHER AND THE REFORMATION. Vol. II. By James Mackinnon, D.D.  
Longmans. 16s.

In his first volume, which was reviewed in this journal at the time of its appearance, Dr. Mackinnon traced the early life of the great reformer up to the beginning of the controversy over Indulgences in 1517; this volume carries on the story through the most decisive years of Luther's history, and describes the events leading to the final breach with Rome in 1521.

Luther began the struggle quite unwittingly, desiring merely to dispute with fellow-theologians a subject upon which his mind had some doubts. He was by nature conservative, and his training had made him respectful of authority. But the controversy, once started, developed far beyond the limits which had existed in Luther's mind, and he found himself driven on from point to point by the compulsion of events and of his own inner convictions, until he became an open rebel against his ecclesiastical superiors and the Pope himself.

Dr. Mackinnon insists that religious experience rather than theological speculation was ultimately responsible for the position which Luther took up and for the Reformation which followed it. Here he is undoubtedly right; none the less Luther at the first came forward as a devout son of the Church, whose last wish was to attack her or exalt himself against her. It was only when he found that his individual liberty was threatened and that attempts were made to crush him that he became defiant. His own experience and the dogmatic system of the mediæval Church were at variance; conscience and the Scriptures made him steadfast in standing by the former.

As those who know Dr. Mackinnon's previous work would naturally expect, he traces out the development of Luther's mind and policy with sympathy and skill. Whilst not blind to his faults, largely to be accounted



for by his situation and the manners of his day, he yet shows us the heroic and admirable side of the man. The Reformation was too big a thing for good or evil, had too vast an influence upon the world of today, for mere prejudice to prevent a sincere study of it. Dr. Mackinnon's work is to be commended, especially to those who read English only, as a real contribution to the understanding of it and of the great man who was the occasion of its inception.

L. ELLIOTT BINNS.

THE TRUTH ABOUT FASTING: WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO FASTING COMMUNION. By Percy Dearmer. Rivingtons. 3s. 6d.

The title is rather provocative, and so is the book. It is little else than a sustained attack upon the position that "the ancient and laudable practice" of fasting before Communion means a strict fast. Of fasting in general the author speaks only incidentally.

The attack is vigorous and well prepared, but not always with the best of taste, as, for instance, when the author, who has no love for St. Augustine, alludes quite gratuitously—for it has nothing to do with the subject—to "the treachery of Count Boniface, the friend and disciple of Augustine"; nor yet with scrupulous accuracy. To say baldly of the Eastern Church that a man may dispense himself if he thinks it necessary is not quite what Dr. Wickham Legg says in the reference given, and still less does it represent the quotation from M. Faminski, parish priest of Nishni-Novgorod, from whom Dr. W. Legg drew his information: "Generally speaking, we always insist on fasting Communion."

To encounter a slip like this on an early page of the book makes one a little suspicious of the arguments which follow. And, indeed, there is—along with much interesting and some new information—a great deal of special pleading. We hope the book, which is largely a *réchauffé* of Bishop Kingdon's *Fasting Communion* (1875), will elicit a detailed answer from Father Puller, as Kingdon's did from Dr. Bright. It is obviously impossible to examine Dr. Dearmer's various points seriatim in a review.

But here are some that he appears to make. *Jejunus* did not originally mean more than abstinent (*non pransus*). It would not necessarily imply that a man had not had his morning draught. We may compare, though Dr. Dearmer does not, *nudus*=without an *outer* garment. Both words have intensified their meaning in the course of time. Anyhow, the discovery will not help the advocates of *evening* Communion. *Placuit Spiritus Sancto* may mean no more than "a council has decreed."

Some of the "proof" quotations referred to by earlier writers on the subject are now admitted to be forgeries; whilst others refer to the Lenten or Holy Week fasts, not to the so-called "natural" fast before Communion.

But however much you attenuate *jejunus*, you cannot eviscerate "in honorem tanti sacramenti in os Christiani prius Dominicum corpus quam ceteri cibi," fortified as it is by parallel expressions, both earlier, as from Alexandria and "the Egyptian Church Order" (Roman), and later as from Spain (572). It is really rather a large demand to make upon us that such a succession of theologians and Latinists as Gratian, Aquinas, Jeremy Taylor, Dr. Bright, should all have been wrong in their interpretation of Justin's meaning, and that Dr. Dearmer alone should be right.



Augustine may have used a rhetorical exaggeration when he asserts that the custom of strictly fasting Communion was universal, but, as Father Puller points out, he had exceptional opportunities for knowing, being himself an African, and having lived in Rome and Milan, and being in frequent correspondence with Egypt and Syria. That he himself, rather under protest, allowed an exception for Maundy Thursday, which a Council shortly afterwards disallowed, proves nothing but (a) the existence of the rule; and (b) that it was not at his time so rigidly observed as it afterwards became.

As was natural, there was more uncertainty as to the exact nature of the fast, and as to what circumstances, if any, constituted a dispensation, than as to the obligation itself. The tendency in this, as in many other things, was towards rigidity, especially in the West. Possibly, as in later times, those who would have allowed that a morning draught did not break the fast were compelled by instances of the dangers that might result (Dr. Dearmer gives examples) to tighten the reins. With us many who have no Manichean horror of alcohol in itself are yet advocates of (even compulsory) total abstinence for somewhat similar reasons. At any rate, there were many centuries of common consent behind the Council of Constance, when in answer to the Hussites it decreed that only cases of infirmity and necessity recognized by the Church and Canon Law constituted sufficient reason for disregarding the custom. Whether Aquinas was right in designating a non-fasting Communion a mortal sin depends upon what we mean by sin.

St. Paul says expressly that anyone who acts in such matters contrary to his conscience—i.e., his convictions—to him it is sin. But we should all agree that the writer of a tract quoted by Dr. Dearmer, and referred to more than once in the recent discussions in Convocation, completely overstated his case by coupling without explanation or qualifications as examples of mortal sin "going to Communion after breaking the fast; stealing a large sum or a small sum from a person extremely poor." It was ill-considered statements like these which excited the wrath of Dr. Pusey, and brings a godly custom into contempt.

Dr. Dearmer hardly does justice to the evidence for the acceptance by the reformed Church of England of the obligation to observe the rule. He is content to quote the evidence collected by Mr. Vernon Staley in the third volume of *Hierurgia Anglicana*. He adds, indeed, a single reference in an opposite sense from Roger Hutchinson, who, whilst admitting (under Edward VI.) that "the custom now is" to receive fasting, adds (as the Lutherans did) that "he doth not ill which by occasion cometh after he hath eaten and drunk." Against that we may put the plea urged by the martyred Protestant Bishop Ferrars in answer to an accusation that he had taken a wedding without celebrating that he had had to ride fourteen miles, and could not take the service fasting (Foxe's *Martyrs*, vol. vii., p. 12, ed. 1870). Evidently it did not occur to anybody that this was a case of such "necessity" as would relax the rule. But as showing how universally the rule was admitted no better quotation could be given, because it takes it for granted and does not argue about it, than one which was pointed out to the writer of this review by Mr. Currie, a former Principal of Wells, in Hooker (book iv., chap. ii., § 3). Controverting the Puritans' contention that no rule or custom was to be observed for which there was not direct scriptural authority, he says: "It is not, I am right sure, their meaning that we should now assemble



our people to serve God in close and secret meetings; or that common brooks or rivers should be used for places of baptism; or that the Eucharist should be received after meat, etc." It is probable that only in Georgian times, when an early breakfast and a late hour for Matins had become fashionable, and all discipline had become slack, that the rule was generally forgotten, but there are traces of its survival well on into the nineteenth century; and in any case it does not argue well for the advocates of its abolition that they have to seek their precedents from the days of Hoadly and Walpole, when Church life was at its lowest. We agree with the Bishop of Truro that the whole subject wants a much more careful and systematic examination than it has yet received. We are by no means persuaded by Dr. Dearmer that Christ meant "to guard the Church against all fasting regulations"; that St. Paul had not (as St. Augustine said he had) anything to do with separating the Eucharist from the Agape; that the Christian meeting before daybreak mentioned by Pliny was not the Eucharist; nor yet—and this conviction seems to have prompted the writing of his book—that eleven o'clock on Sunday morning is the best hour for the Lord's service at which all the faithful should communicate. It interferes badly with the day's outing, which with the cry of "Every man his motor-car" is becoming increasingly and unblamably popular. To this an *early* Eucharist, and a return in time for Evensong and Sermon, or a visit to some other church, offer no hindrance.

S. COOPER.

MAN AND THE SUPERNATURAL. By Evelyn Underhill. Methuen. 7s. 6d.

To outline in simple terms a personal and constructive philosophy of religion is no small undertaking, yet we do not hesitate to affirm that Miss Underhill succeeds beyond anything we should have thought possible within the compass of some 270 odd pages. There is a widespread and increasing "interest" in religion combined with a reluctance for discipline and sacrifice in the quest after truth. "Religion made easy" both for the understanding and for the heart is the demand of our time, and it is being met by all kinds of substitutes, including Christianity without a Cross, Christianity not mysterious, and churchmanship without a Creed. It is refreshing, therefore, to turn to a book which seeks to get back to first principles, and to point to the solution of spiritual problems along the lines, not of impossible compromise with the facts of human life, but of fullest recognition of the comprehensive character of our many-sided approach towards reality. In such a philosophy the fullest justice must be done to the sacramental principle, and its application in the realm of religion; the duality of full human experience, man's implicit participation in eternity as well as time; the frank acceptance of the values of the transcendent and a consequent rejection of much in our modern thought which clings to mere immanentism as an adequate explanation. All this and more is found with engaging frankness and persuasive presentation in a work the title of which—*Man and the Supernatural*—emphasizes the distinction in kind between the successive life of Nature and the eternal life of God, and so warns us against the dangers of Monism. To speak of two sorts of reality or of a two-foldness that goes right through man's experience—to contend for the values suggested by such contradictory or (shall we say?) complementary terms as Nature and Supernature, Eternity and Time, God and the World, Infinite and Finite, Creator



and Creature—is to develop a philosophy frankly at variance with much modern thought and speculation in the realm of the philosophy of religion, but nevertheless at the same time it is to be true to the deepest analysis of man's nature, and his place in time and eternity.

Baron von Hügel was never tired of warning us that religion has no subtler, and yet also no deadlier, enemy in the region of the mind than every and all monism: and this because the Otherness, the Prevenience of God, the one-sided relation between God and man, constitute the deepest measure and touchstone of all religion. Miss Underhill's work is one sustained effort to uphold this position, and to warn us of the dangers which inevitably accompany any attempt to slur the religious distinction between Creator and creature. The element of "Otherness," the utter distinctness of God and the supernatural is one to which our age must with increasing emphasis do justice if we are to make any healthy recovery from the excessive immanentism and disguised pantheism of our modern religious thought. We need, says our authoress, a philosophic scheme which marks the absolute distinctness in kind between the richly personal, yet spaceless reality of God—and, depending on this, the derived reality of the God-possessed—and all that is not God or thus God-possessed: between supernatural and natural worlds; and this because the richest experiences of the spiritual life are shut from those who give up this specific religious emphasis on the otherness and self-sufficing transcendence of God.

We have marked page after page and passage after passage in this book which will repay careful study. No short notice or review can do it justice. We can only recommend it wholeheartedly to both clergy and laity, since one of its supreme merits is its delightful freedom from technicalities and its careful avoidance of the jargon of the professional philosophers and theologians.

H. M. RELTON.

---

THE GOSPEL OF SADHU SUNDAR SINGH. By Friedrich Heiler, Ph.D., D.D.  
Abridged translation by Olive Wyon. Allen and Unwin. 12s. 6d.

Western readers are already familiar with the personality of the Indian Christian who is generally known as The Sadhu. Very far removed from the ways of twentieth-century Europeans, yet so truly modelled on the lines laid down in the Gospel that he inevitably recalls St. Francis of Assisi, Sundar Singh constitutes a most attractive study, and many have attempted to portray and to interpret him. Dr. Heiler's book, which now appears in an English translation, may be regarded as valuable beyond all the studies that have preceded it. Careful investigation of facts, sympathetic yet discerning judgment, and a wide knowledge of the various types of religious experience and of ecclesiastical organization have combined to produce a reliable work, full of interest, illuminating, inspiring, reassuring, and yet disturbing. It first provides a sketch of Sikhism, the ancestral faith of the Sadhu, in order to indicate the nature of the spiritual influences in the midst of which the boy was reared. There follows the story of his life, in which the balance is fairly held between the excessive claims of the enthusiastic hagiographer and the minimizing criticisms of the rationalist historian. The content of Sundar Singh's religious life is next acutely analyzed in its contemplative and active aspects in turn. His thought-



our people to serve God in close and secret meetings; or that common brooks or rivers should be used for places of baptism; or that the *Eucharist should be received after meat*, etc." It is probable that only in Georgian times, when an early breakfast and a late hour for Matins had become fashionable, and all discipline had become slack, that the rule was generally forgotten, but there are traces of its survival well on into the nineteenth century; and in any case it does not argue well for the advocates of its abolition that they have to seek their precedents from the days of Hoadly and Walpole, when Church life was at its lowest. We agree with the Bishop of Truro that the whole subject wants a much more careful and systematic examination than it has yet received. We are by no means persuaded by Dr. Dearmer that Christ meant "to guard the Church against all fasting regulations"; that St. Paul had not (as St. Augustine said he had) anything to do with separating the Eucharist from the Agape; that the Christian meeting before daybreak mentioned by Pliny was not the Eucharist; nor yet—and this conviction seems to have prompted the writing of his book—that eleven o'clock on Sunday morning is the best hour for the Lord's service at which all the faithful should communicate. It interferes badly with the day's outing, which with the cry of "Every man his motor-car" is becoming increasingly and unblamably popular. To this an *early* Eucharist, and a return in time for Evensong and Sermon, or a visit to some other church, offer no hindrance.

S. COOPER.

MAN AND THE SUPERNATURAL. By Evelyn Underhill. Methuen. 7s. 6d.

To outline in simple terms a personal and constructive philosophy of religion is no small undertaking, yet we do not hesitate to affirm that Miss Underhill succeeds beyond anything we should have thought possible within the compass of some 270 odd pages. There is a widespread and increasing "interest" in religion combined with a reluctance for discipline and sacrifice in the quest after truth. "Religion made easy" both for the understanding and for the heart is the demand of our time, and it is being met by all kinds of substitutes, including Christianity without a Cross, Christianity not mysterious, and churchmanship without a Creed. It is refreshing, therefore, to turn to a book which seeks to get back to first principles, and to point to the solution of spiritual problems along the lines, not of impossible compromise with the facts of human life, but of fullest recognition of the comprehensive character of our many-sided approach towards reality. In such a philosophy the fullest justice must be done to the sacramental principle, and its application in the realm of religion; the duality of full human experience, man's implicit participation in eternity as well as time; the frank acceptance of the values of the transcendent and a consequent rejection of much in our modern thought which clings to mere immanentism as an adequate explanation. All this and more is found with engaging frankness and persuasive presentation in a work the title of which—*Man and the Supernatural*—emphasizes the distinction in kind between the successive life of Nature and the eternal life of God, and so warns us against the dangers of Monism. To speak of two sorts of reality or of a two-foldness that goes right through man's experience—to contend for the values suggested by such contradictory or (shall we say?) complementary terms as Nature and Supernature, Eternity and Time, God and the World, Infinite and Finite, Creator



and Creature—is to develop a philosophy frankly at variance with much modern thought and speculation in the realm of the philosophy of religion, but nevertheless at the same time it is to be true to the deepest analysis of man's nature, and his place in time and eternity.

Baron von Hügel was never tired of warning us that religion has no subtler, and yet also no deadlier, enemy in the region of the mind than every and all monism: and this because the Otherness, the Prevenience of God, the one-sided relation between God and man, constitute the deepest measure and touchstone of all religion. Miss Underhill's work is one sustained effort to uphold this position, and to warn us of the dangers which inevitably accompany any attempt to slur the religious distinction between Creator and creature. The element of "Otherness," the utter distinctness of God and the supernatural is one to which our age must with increasing emphasis do justice if we are to make any healthy recovery from the excessive immanentism and disguised pantheism of our modern religious thought. We need, says our authoress, a philosophic scheme which marks the absolute distinctness in kind between the richly personal, yet spaceless reality of God—and, depending on this, the derived reality of the God-possessed—and all that is not God or thus God-possessed: between supernatural and natural worlds; and this because the richest experiences of the spiritual life are shut from those who give up this specific religious emphasis on the otherness and self-sufficing transcendence of God.

We have marked page after page and passage after passage in this book which will repay careful study. No short notice or review can do it justice. We can only recommend it wholeheartedly to both clergy and laity, since one of its supreme merits is its delightful freedom from technicalities and its careful avoidance of the jargon of the professional philosophers and theologians.

H. M. RELTON.

---

THE GOSPEL OF SADHU SUNDAR SINGH. By Friedrich Heiler, Ph.D., D.D.  
Abridged translation by Olive Wyon. Allen and Unwin. 12s. 6d.

Western readers are already familiar with the personality of the Indian Christian who is generally known as The Sadhu. Very far removed from the ways of twentieth-century Europeans, yet so truly modelled on the lines laid down in the Gospel that he inevitably recalls St. Francis of Assisi, Sundar Singh constitutes a most attractive study, and many have attempted to portray and to interpret him. Dr. Heiler's book, which now appears in an English translation, may be regarded as valuable beyond all the studies that have preceded it. Careful investigation of facts, sympathetic yet discerning judgment, and a wide knowledge of the various types of religious experience and of ecclesiastical organization have combined to produce a reliable work, full of interest, illuminating, inspiring, reassuring, and yet disturbing. It first provides a sketch of Sikhism, the ancestral faith of the Sadhu, in order to indicate the nature of the spiritual influences in the midst of which the boy was reared. There follows the story of his life, in which the balance is fairly held between the excessive claims of the enthusiastic hagiographer and the minimizing criticisms of the rationalist historian. The content of Sundar Singh's religious life is next acutely analyzed in its contemplative and active aspects in turn. His thought-



world is clearly displayed with the aid of illustrative extracts from his own writings. And finally his significance is estimated for the Christian religion, for India, and for Western Christianity. The reader closes the book with a mingled sense of gratitude to the writer, of profound admiration for the Sadhu, and of perplexity concerning the divided Church. "His whole life and activity enforce one of his ruling ideas: ecclesiasticism and Christianity are not the same thing" (p. 262). That is the disturbing thought that is left over, disturbing because it is not the platitudinous reflection of a theorist, but the conviction of a life obviously radiant with Christian light and power.

O. HARDMAN.

### BOOK NOTES

*The Religious Attitude.* A Psychological Study of its Differentiation. By A. S. Woodburne. The Macmillan Company. 10s. 6d. The author makes use of a first-hand knowledge of the Hinduism of Southern India and of a considerable acquaintance with the literature of the history of religion generally in an interesting study written to differentiate religion from magic, science, art, and morality. He succeeds in marking off the religious attitude clearly and convincingly, and in so doing provides a useful introduction to the comparative study of religion well abreast of recent work.

*The Religious Mind.* A Psychological Study of Religious Experience. By C. K. Mahoney. The Macmillan Company. 8s. 6d. A popular treatment of its subject which ranges far and wide and says many true things, but nowhere plumbs the depths.

*The Secret Paths of Divine Love.* Edited by Dom Justin McCann. *The Mirror of Simple Souls.* Edited by Clare Kirchberger. Burns Oates and Washbourne. 5s. and 7s. 6d. each. Two welcome additions to the desirable series of Orchard Books. The former was written by Father Constantine Barbanson, Capuchin Friar and Guardian of the Convent of Cologne (1581-1632), and is well known as one of the favourite works of his contemporary, the Benedictine contemplative, Father Augustine Baker. The latter is the work of an unknown French mystic of the thirteenth century, discovered so recently as 1911 in an English translation which is believed to date from the time of Walter Hilton. It has a useful introduction, and is to be recommended as a devotional aid and as new material for the study of mysticism.

*Richard Rolle's Version of the Penitential Psalms, with his Commentary, based on that of St. Augustine.* Rendered and edited by Geraldine Hodgson, Litt.D. Faith Press. 1s. 6d. From the prose rendering of the Psalter which is attributed to Richard of Hampole, the fourteenth-century English mystic, the seven penitential Psalms are here reproduced, with their verse by verse commentary, as a help to meditation. Dr. Hodgson contributes an introduction.

*Days of Quiet.* By the author of *The Way*. Mowbray. 2s. It is suggested that God sometimes calls us to be quiet when it is not possible to go into retreat, and that it is right and most profitable then to spend a day in church alone with God. With this need in view the author has provided helpful material for three such days. The book should be bought and put by, ready for use when occasion arises.



*Comfort and Sure Confidence.* By A. W. Hopkinson. Mowbray. 3s. 6d. An excellent little manual of readings and prayers for the use both of the sick and of those who visit them, together with some notes on the visitation of the sick. The book is characterized by a Christian attitude towards sickness; it seeks to help the sick to make good use of the times of sickness, and it remembers that there are sick children to be helped.

*More Eton Fables.* By C. Alington. Longmans. 3s. 6d. Twelve more examples of Dr. Alington's peculiar skill in devising addresses which shall attract and hold the attention of boys and make them think out the meaning of life. There is something good in each of them; but nine people out of ten looking through the titles will select "The Boy who was late for Chapel," and will be pleased.

*The World's Pilgrim.* By E. Gore-Booth. Longmans. 3s. 6d. Imaginary conversations introducing such diverse characters as the Buddha, Pythagoras, the Blessed Virgin, and St. Francis of Assisi, and revealing the poetic mind and sympathetic insight of one whose spirit found rest in a Christian Platonism. O. H.

*Christianity and Nature.* By John T. Bird. Allen and Unwin. 3s. 6d. We know of men who have lived in close contact with the things of nature, and who have possessed very deep spiritual insight. This book is very interesting; the author has a distinctly sacramental view of nature, and though a few of the analogies are a trifle far-fetched, yet throughout there is much that is real, much that is helpful. He finds in phenomena of nature not only guides to spiritual truth, but media of spiritual truth. Illustrations are windows which enlighten the soul, God through His handiwork teaches us of Himself. E. C. P.

*An Introduction to Ecclesiastical Latin.* By H. P. V. Nunn. Cambridge University Press. 6s. First published in 1922, this modest little work has now appeared in a second edition. Comparison will naturally be made with Dr. H. J. White's recent *Grammar of the Vulgate*. Mr. Nunn would disclaim expert knowledge of the type displayed in that book. But we think his book more useful for beginners. The grammar is set out with exceeding clearness, and the deviations from the classical usage are shown. Readings from ecclesiastical writers down to the *Imitation of Christ* occupy the last forty pages.

*Futile Sermons.* By C. L. Drawbridge. Longmans. 4s. 6d. In the autumn of 1925 the Archbishop of Canterbury preached a sermon to the Church Congress, in which he complained about the inadequacy of many sermons. Mr. Drawbridge in this book collects the references to the sermon made by the Press and adds some comments of his own.

*Christ in the Common Ways of Life.* By C. S. Woodward. Longmans. 2s. 6d. Short, plain, and practical chapters on Christ and His teaching, the offering of self, the childlike spirit, the spirit of service, our daily work, amusements, money, citizenship, the enabling spirit, the vision of the kingdom. Carefully pondered, whether in Lent or at other times, they are likely to benefit the reader. Some passages suffer from the limitations of space. Thus on p. 71: "To buy shares today in the hope that tomorrow they may rise to the advantage of our pockets . . . is unchristian." This



is too hasty a judgment. Speculation, within limits, is perfectly justifiable, and performs a useful social function not always appreciated by those in receipt of fixed incomes. On p. 73 Canon Woodward asks reprovingly: "Have we not often asked the shopkeeper if he has not the same article at a rather cheaper price?" But if it is cheaper it is not the same article. The cheapness is more probably caused by the use of inferior material than by the payment of sweating wages.

*Hartley through the Ages.* By the Rev. Gerard W. Bancks, M.A. There is a tendency in many local histories to concentrate somewhat unduly on the church and manor. But in the story of Hartley as told by its Rector the scope has been greatly extended, and includes accounts of twenty old houses and their inhabitants, the roads, the people, the local names and the local legends, while the history of the place is sketched from the Ice Age down to the present century. The small events of a small village are presented in a very attractive form, and the available sources seem to have been used to the best advantage. No doubt, since we are told that the parish registers extend back no further than the early eighteenth century, much has been lost; but the omissions are more than compensated for by the care which has been taken to collect what remains and present it in an interesting manner. The book is admirably illustrated and clearly printed, and should serve as a model for similar histories of similar small parishes.

W. K. L. C.

In *Rationalism and Orthodoxy of Today* (S.C.M., 5s.) Mr. Beibitz attempts an essay in Christian philosophy. If there is no better test of philosophy than that it gives a far-reaching and inclusive explanation of the facts of which science is the description, Mr. Beibitz is concerned to show that this test is satisfied, in completest measure, by that ancient philosophy of the creative and immanent work which came to a new birth and life in the religion in the Incarnate Word. The essay is thus an attempt to exhibit Christianity, not as a system which needs defence, but as the basis of the most satisfactory philosophy of the universe, when interpreted in the terms of the ancient Logos doctrine. A considerable part of the earlier chapters is occupied by a discussion and criticism of Mr. Julian Huxley's *Essays of a Biologist*.

Mr. Donald Hole, the much-beloved Honorary Secretary of the Actors' Church Union, gives us a straightforward and temperate examination of the claims of Spiritualism in a work published by the Society of SS. Peter and Paul under the title *Spiritualism in Relation to Science and Religion* (3s. 6d.).

Mr. H. Levison of the U.F. Manse, Johnshaven, under the title *Passion-tide* (T. and T. Clark, 5s.), has produced in book form lectures delivered to members of his congregation as aids to the devotional study of the last days of the earthly life of the Master. His plea that devotion should, so far as possible, be intelligent is a sound one which needs emphasis. A perusal of these lectures enables us to see how scholarship can be employed as an aid to devotion.

H. M. R.



# INDEX OF VOLUME XVI

JANUARY—JUNE, 1928

	PAGE
ACLAND, R. D.	217, 218
Anglican Doctrine of the Church, The	137
Authorship of the Fourth Gospel	258
BADCOCK, J. S.	164
BICKNELL, E. J.	50
Bishop Ken and Robert Nelson	128
BLOOMFIELD, F. B. and H. G.	105
Books Noticed:	
Adventure. By Streeter and Others	290
"Agyptische Literatur, Die." By Max Pieper	293
An A.B.C. of Christian Living. By C. E. Hudson	52
Christianity in the Roman World. By D. Armytage	231
Christian Spirituality. By P. Pourrat	298
Christ the Word. By A. E. Moore	295
Church in the World, The. By W. R. Inge	227
Churches of Eastern Christendom. By B. J. Kidd	175
Confirmation, Vol. II.	173
Conversion of the English, The. H. Curtois	296
Daniel. By J. A. Montgomery	221
Doctrine of God, The. By J. K. Mozley	289
English Mystics, The. By D. Knowles	292
Epistle of St. James. G. H. Rendall	57
Essays in Christian Politics. By Bishop Temple	287
Ethical Basis of Reality. By E. E. Thomas	119
Ethics of Gospel and of Nature. By H. H. Scullard	236
English Monumental Sculpture. By K. Esdaile	350
Eustathius of Antioch. By R. V. Sellers	349
Fastidius, Works of. By R. T. S. Haalehurst	119
Fasting, The Truth about. By P. Dearmer	351
Fellowship of the Veld. By G. Callaway	232
First Steps in Philosophy of Religion. By C. Harris	55
George Hay Forbes. By W. Perry	229
Glory of God, The. By W. H. G. Holmes	178
Great Physician, The. By A. J. Gayner Banks	52
Indian Mystic, The. By C. J. Winslow	112
Introduction to Study of N.T., An. By A. H. McNeile	50
Kant's Philosophy of Religion. By C. C. J. Webb	110
Kingdom of God, The	294
Later Greek Religion. By Edwyn Bevan	118
Latin Infancy Gospels. By M. R. James	234
Lectures in Hyde Park, II. By C. F. Rogers	180
Luther and the Reformation. Vol. II. By J. Mackinnon	351
Making of Luke-Acts, The. By H. J. Cadbury	233
Man and the Supernatural. By E. Underhill	354
Minucius Felix. By H. J. Bayliss	297
Necessity of Redemption, The. By P. Hartill	235
New Stories in Mystical Religion. By Rufus Jones	292
Old Catholic Churches and Reunion. By C. B. Moss	118
Old Hebrew Text of St. Matthew. H. J. Schonfield	232
Old Latin Texts of the Heptateuch. By A. V. Billen	57
Original Jerusalem Gospel, The. By J. M. C. Crum	53
Paolo Veronese. By P. H. Osmond	58
Plainsong Accompaniment. By J. H. Arnold	56
Principles and Precepts. By H. Rashdall	116
Psychology of Religion. By C. C. Josey	116
Rescue Work. By E. C. Frenholme	179
Rise of Gentile Christianity. By F. J. Foakes-Jackson	228
Sacrifice and Sacrament. By E. O. James	236
Sadhu Sundar Singh, The Gospel of. By F. Heiler	355
Short Notices	60, 237
Sociality. By A. Lee	59
Some Authentic Acts of Early Martyrs. By E. C. E. Owen	117
Son of Zebedee, The. By H. P. V. Nunn	55
Spiritual Exercises. By Æ. Tillyard	224
Spiritual Letters of Fr. Congreve	299
Stone Age, The. By E. O. James	54
Textual Discoveries in Proverbs, Psalms, and Isaiah. By Melville Scott	48
Treasury of the Faith, The	230



	PAGE
William Law and 18th Century Quakerism. By S. Hobhouse	115
Wisdom of Egypt and the O.T. By W. O. E. Oesterley	230
York Minster Historical Tracts	113
BROWNE-WILKINSON, A. R.	270
CANNON, W. W.	48, 310
Cathedrals Commission, Report of	72
Catholic Movement and Prayer-Book	241
CHARNWOOD, Lord	287
CHELMSFORD, Bishop of	173
Children in a Country Parish	89
Christ, Two Ministries of	252, 319
Cisalpinism	334
CLARKE, W. K. L.	161, 284
Correspondence	36
DE BURGH, W. G.	289
Deism and Sacramental Belief	10
Devotion of the Body of Christ, A	270
DEWAR, LINDSAY	79, 224
Dr. Heiler and Lausanne	281
Editorial	1, 61, 121, 181, 241, 301
EDWARDS, H. E.	248
"Expecto" and other Books	301
Faith and Order	123
Fasting Communion, Report on	166
GAVIN, F.	102
German Survey of English Theology	284
GORDON GEORGE, R. E.	123
GRAHAM, E.	19, 143
GUILLAUME, A.	221
HIGSON, J. E.	184
HUTTON, W. H.	72, 328
JAMES, E. O.	2
Josephine Butler	184
LACHY, T. A.	204
LEVETOFF, P.	25
MACKENNIE, K. D.	131
MACMUN, V.	252, 319
Malines, Conversations at	192
Michel de Bay	204
MOSLEY, J. K.	262
NEVILLE, F.	218
NOCK, A. D.	152
Orthodoxy and Church Unity	123
Our Lord's Temptations	79
Paul, a Slave of Jesus Christ	46
Periodicals, Notes on	38, 107, 212, 285, 345
Personality	218
PHILLIPS, F. G. A.	89
ΠΟΡΝΕΙΑ, A Further Note on	102
RICHARDSON, A. J.	42
Ruth, The Book of	310
SAVAGE, H. E.	63
Secular Cathedral under Henry VIII., A	63
SELWYN, E. G.	163, 241, 301
Seven Root Sins, The	164
SPARROW-SIMPSON, W. J.	10
SPENS, W.	137
St. Paul among the Jews	25
St. Peter and a Central See	278
Studies in Texts	105, 161
TAYLOR, A. E.	110
Tongues at Pentecost, The	248
TRIMMER, G. H.	258
TURNER, C. H.	192
Was St. Paul Crucified at Perga?	42
World into which Christianity Came, The	19, 143
Verse	217
WILLINK, M. D. R.	46
Worship and the Eucharist	262